





Presented to  
The Library  
of the  
University of Toronto  
by

*A. Castell, Esq.*





ANGLOPHOBIA



C.7716a

# ANGLOPHOBIA

AN ANALYSIS OF ANTI-BRITISH  
PREJUDICE IN THE UNITED STATES

BY

J. G. COOK



217067  
8:10:27

BOSTON  
THE FOUR SEAS COMPANY  
1919

*Copyright, 1919, by*  
THE FOUR SEAS COMPANY



The Four Seas Press  
Boston, Mass., U. S. A.



## PREFACE

THE contents of this volume are the substance, and in some degree the arrangement of pieces, published originally in a county newspaper. The very flattering comments of personal friends who read them—some no doubt uttered to soothe my vanity—as well as the love and affection that I bear to this the mental child of my old age whose feeble life I desire to preserve, have combined to induce me to revise them, eliminate, add to, polish and collect them into this form. These considerations, with some, may not be a satisfactory answer to the question, “why this waste of time, labor and printer’s paper—the last thing at this time regarded as a big item in the high cost of living—adding one more volume to the immeasurable mass of unsaleable books now piled up in the warehouses, shelves and cellars of publishing houses awaiting a conflagration and insurance adjuster?” To these imaginary Missourians who insist on being shown, I will explain that the only available statistics on the subject that I have been able to gather prove that ninety-nine and one half per cent of all the subscribers

and borrowers of that newspaper, never read a word of any of those papers; but after glancing at the repulsive looking title—"Anglophobia"—would pass it up, thinking it was a discourse on some disreputable and unpalatable patent medicine, or something concerning mad dogs. Some of these people deserve another chance to add to their knowledge, hence this book.

I have not a solitary doubt that this book will be a complete failure, financially, instructively or in the capacity to survive one edition; but I trust my readers will not indulge in too much tearful sympathy for me on that account, for the number and character of the failures in my life has rendered me somewhat callous to the pain and mortification that once accompanied them. It may be instructive to my friends and gratifying to enemies to mention a few of them:

Among the earliest failures of my life was when at the age of 17 years, in the year 1862, I attempted with others to thrash "Uncle Sam," an effort that was not in the main a success, "but quite to the contrary," as was remarked by a passenger on a ship to a lady, when she asked him if he had breakfasted.

The civil and criminal dockets of the courts in this and adjoining counties for the past forty-

three years will disclose many failures to win verdicts that I knew my clients were entitled to. At first such adverse verdicts would distress and disappoint me more than they would my clients, even when the death penalty was included; but later in life I could listen to an adverse verdict with perfect immobility of countenance and without a quiver of an eye-lash, at the same time secretly blaspheming the jury and its verdict in a manner that was perfectly withering and unchristianlike.

It was in the year 1878 that I undertook the spiritual instruction in a Sunday school of eight or nine boys, aged from 10 to 14 years; my success in that undertaking was not good; in fact, not to put too fine a point on it, it was a dismal failure. My attention was painfully called to the fact of such a failure by being called upon some years later to assist in extricating one of those boys from a mine down in Mexico, whither he had been sent by the constituted authorities of that most unhappy country for helping to rob a train. A vivacious young lady suggested, when I told of that experience in her hearing, that I had exhibited my usual prescience by giving such instruction to those boys as would afterwards enable me to make a fee out of them; which re-

mark implied that I had given those youngsters practical instructions in regard to train robbing and how to commit other felonies.

While it is a fact that I was perfectly innocent of any such purpose, forethought or instruction, the circumstances tended to justify her remark to that degree that I was wholly unprepared to make any answer to her accusation, and it was more than a week before I was able to formulate a suitable rejoinder to her repartee.

A spark of satisfaction will remain to me regardless of the fate of this little book, and that is, that although it occupies but an infinitesimal space in the literary world it will be first to occupy this particular field of literary exploitation. For more than sixty years I have been an omniverous and reasonably intelligent reader, and with average memory, and I do not now recall any writer who has attempted to combat the prejudices that some Americans have against the English government and people, and show the groundlessness of such dislike. An Englishman is, and ought to be too proud and independent to combat a prejudice that he knows to be groundless—American writers seem to have regarded the subject as unimportant and not worth their serious thought.

It has been asserted by quite a number of people that the whole theme of "Anglophobia" is merely a fad or hobby of my own, and that there is not in the United States such widespread anti-English or pro-German sentiment as I assume in this book; and my experience and opportunity for observation are too limited as to number of persons talked to, and area of country investigated, to furnish a basis for such generalization. It is my belief, however, formed from an observation of more than fifty years, that there exists in the minds of a vast number of Americans of Anglo-Saxon descent, a deep seated hatred for Great Britain, the reason for which they are not able to state clearly. The contention however is not susceptible of proof one way or the other and so it is left for the individual reader to sound, or to listen to, the sentiment of the people in his own locality or elsewhere, and formulate his own opinion as to whether this essay is entirely useless or is calculated to serve a laudable purpose.

With an earnest and patriotic aim to serve such a purpose, I now launch this frail bark upon the uncertain sea of public opinion, with all its imperfections on its head, where lurking submarine critics are submerged, ready to discharge

a satirical torpedo at its feeble and frightened body, if found to be worth the ammunition.

And now, O most respected and honored reader, to conciliate you and win your good will and forgiveness, I will tell you truthfully that this is my first, last and only venture; and like Cid Hamet Benengeli when he completed his history of the life and adventures of the redoubtable Don Quixote, I will now give my pen an unbroken eternal rest:

"Condemned at length to be forgotten quite  
With all the pages which 'twas thine to write."

J. G. COOK

*Burnet, Texas.*

# CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	15
THE AMERICAN'S FIRST IMPRESSIONS . . .	22
CHOOSING AN ENEMY . . . . .	32
BLOOD'S THICKER THAN WATER . . . .	50
UNPREPAREDNESS VS. READINESS . . . .	59
IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN . . . . .	69
SOME LAW-MAKERS AND SOME LAWYERS AFFECTED . . . . .	80
AMERICAN MILITARY CASTE—CONTRABAND —EMBARGO . . . . .	90
EMBARGO, PROPAGANDISTS, AND AMERICAN ESAUS . . . . .	101
CIVILIZATION, AND PLANS OF PAUL KRUGER	108
ORIGINAL "SCRAP OF PAPER" TRÉATY— DOGS OF WAR LET LOOSE . . . . .	116
COMPARATIVE MANHOOD—KRUGER AND A MIER PRISONER . . . . .	124
PARALLEL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN IN THE TREAT- MENT OF MORMONS, FILIPINOS, AND BOERS . . . . .	131





# ANGLOPHOBIA

---

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

THE foregoing caption is not intended as a conundrum; it is merely a question to be answered—unsatisfactorily it may be—in this and succeeding chapters. The word “Anglophobia” is defined by Webster to be “Dislike of England,” and the term will be hereinafter applied to Americans of Anglo-Saxon blood who are affected in this way. It can be readily understood why many Irish-Americans and German-Americans dislike Great Britain, but it requires some thought and historic investigation to understand why Anglo-Saxon Americans should entertain hatred and vindictive dislike towards people of their own blood, traditions, and history. The only harm resulting heretofore from this feeling was to cause the two nationalities, who are essentially the same in all of those characteristics that make for the highest order of modern civilization, to

become to a certain degree estranged; and to cause Americans to view the British Government with distrust and suspicion. The existence and extent of this feeling of Americans against them has caused many Englishmen, who might have immigrated to the United States and become citizens and mingled with our people and have reinforced the ever decreasing proportion of Anglo-Saxon blood in our nation, to migrate to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, East India, and to other English-speaking colonies and dependencies of Great Britain; where they were welcomed and where they would not be wounded by expressions of dislike for their mother country. It is not easy to estimate the effect upon our country of losing that reinforcement of Anglo-Saxon blood, and so increase the proportion of blood of the strange untempered people from Eastern Europe and Western Asia that have swarmed to our shores, and become citizens of our country.

There can be no more auspicious or appropriate time to combat this prejudice against the English government than the present, and if possible to remove it by exhibiting its groundlessness. Few Anglophobists in America are able off hand to state the reason for their dislike, which proves

that the feeling is founded on prejudice created from misinformation or hearsay.

The two nations are now for the first time in history acting together, waging a terrific war against a common enemy, defending and upholding the principles of liberty and democracy which are the common heritage of both; through the wisest counsellors of both countries they are to-day (April 30, 1917) consulting in regard to the best method of conducting the war and other matters vital to the success of their armies. Within a few short months American boys may be standing in the same line of battle with young Englishmen and charging, falling, and dying for the same great cause of human liberty and democracy; an Englishman may perhaps render first aid to an American, or a wounded British soldier may be carried from the battlefield by an American. There are innumerable kindnesses and help that can be rendered for each other by soldiers fighting for the same cause, and the utmost good will, respect and confidence should exist between soldiers of different nationalities who have to rely upon the courage and fidelity of each other in their deadly conflicts with the enemy.

The world is now entering upon an era wherein the English-speaking nations of the Anglo-

Saxon race, like the tribe of Issachar, will bend their backs to the white man's burdens, upholding the weak, taming the savage, restraining the tyrant, enforcing peace, justice and mercy among the nations of the earth, setting examples that will guide mankind to right and happiness. They must act together and in harmony to accomplish the great work for the human family that lies out before them. There can exist to-day in the heart of a patriotic American no greater or no more exalted desire than to see perfect harmony between the great nations that will soon be called upon to perform that labor of love for humanity. It is these and like considerations that have urged the author to undertake a task that seems to have been ignored by the persons most vitally interested, and that is, the effort to combat those prejudices by showing their groundlessness. The personal and national pride of the English would prevent their condescending to combat prejudices that they regard as unjust and without cause. But the American people are vitally interested in forming and maintaining a fair and unprejudiced judgment of all the nations of the earth with whom they are at peace; more especially the nation with whom the American people are closely allied by blood,

language, laws and traditions, as they are with the English. It might have been reasonably expected that among the many hundreds of gifted American writers who have flourished during the past one hundred or more years, some one of them in the interest of right and justice, and without compromising his love for and loyalty to his own country, would have undertaken to remove or palliate such prejudices, as far as the facts of history would permit. But no such writer has ever attempted to separate the Anglophobists into the different classes or groups as they exist, analyze and trace to their origin the prejudices they entertain.

With no experience as an essayist or writer of books, it is with many doubts and misgivings that the author attempts the exploration of this new field of literary venture; but he is sustained with the hope that should this effort fail to accomplish the purposes designed, it may at least direct public attention to the necessity or expediency of an effort to break down those prejudices and may induce some abler writer to make the effort.

To forestall any impression that the author is biased in favor of English people or is prompted by a feeling of national loyalty to their govern-

ment, or that this is not a perfectly impartial discussion of the subject in hand, it is nothing but right and proper to set down that while he is not an Anglophobist neither is he an "Anglo-maniac," defined by Webster to be one "who has a mania for what is English"; the symptoms of the mania being discernable by one affecting the broad "a," the use of the monocle, and a wasteful and perfectly meaningless use of the word "What" at the end of a sentence, and who is most exquisitely portrayed by Leon Wilson in his "Ruggles of Red Gap." The ancestral head of his family in America emigrated to this country many decades before the Revolutionary war, whose descendants fought the British in that war and in the year 1812, and he is therefore qualified to discuss the subject from an impartial view point.

The author has found difficulty in maintaining that impersonal attitude that is achieved by the practised and gifted writer, and in effacing himself—keeping the ego in the background. Ordinarily the liberal space allowed to the Preface and Introduction ought to afford room enough to contain all the personal pronouns of the first person singular that are required to elucidate his subject. It is not any want of modesty in

the author that causes them to bob up frequently in other places in this book, but rather because of a want of adeptness in arranging the subject matter of his theme, so as to exclude the ego, and keep it penned up in its proper place. The kindly reader is therefore requested to ignore the presence of the personal pronoun where it obtrudes itself, out of its place, the same as you would a pert child attempting to lead in the conversation of grown peoples.

The genus Anglophobist is susceptible of being divided into four separate and distinct species or classes, each having distinct cause for their antipathy, and traceable to want of information, misinformation, conditions no longer existing or misunderstood. The most numerous and most respectable of those having the most reasonable cause for their dislike will be the first in the order of discussion.

## CHAPTER II

### THE AMERICAN'S FIRST IMPRESSIONS

COMMENCING about the year 1790 and continuing to the year 1860—a period of seventy years—the young Americans in nearly every community in the United States, on the 4th day of each July, listened to the reading of the Declaration of Independence, wherein the wrongs and injuries done to this country by the British Government were set forth in clear and incisive language that every one could understand. On these occasions, generally at Fourth of July barbecues, the orator of the day, a member of Congress or some other influential and prominent citizen of the community, in eloquent and forcible language recited all the acts of oppression of the British Government towards the colonies that led up to the Revolutionary war; and would dwell at length upon the right of the Colonists as English subjects to resist all forms of taxation imposed upon them without their consent and without representation in the legislative body levying the tax. These speakers would dwell upon the privation



## The American's First Impressions 23

and suffering of the American soldiers; the glorious victories of American arms by land and sea, etc. At no time during these long series of years at such 4th of July occasions, or elsewhere, did any person speak in behalf of England or offer any excuse or fact in mitigation of the alleged wrongs. Naturally the result of such patriotic appeals and arraignment of England from year to year through more than two generations of citizens was to implant in the minds of Americans a deep antipathy for the English people, without discrimination; a feeling which was handed down from father to son and aggravated and intensified as these charges were made from year to year, especially during and after the war of 1812. The acts of England which brought about this war were also included in the 4th of July orations; and people were told of Americans being forcibly taken from American ships by the commanders of English men-of-war and compelled to serve in the English navy.

Another cause of the anti-English feeling, during the period mentioned, is the fact that previous to our Civil War England was the only great nation with which America had ever been at war, and the loss, suffering and privation to America of the two English wars stood alone without off-

set or comparison with any other war. It is true that a naval war between France and the United States lasted from the beginning of 1799 to the close of 1800, but that war being altogether a naval warfare, did not seem to make much impression on the minds of Americans, or embitter them against the French nation; but it is true nevertheless that the conduct of France toward Americans and American sailors and shipping was far more severe and aggravating than the conduct of England that brought on the war of 1812. These wars with France and Great Britain will be discussed more at length further on.

In respect to the Revolutionary War, Americans during all the period referred to seem not to have considered or known that a great majority of the English people were bitterly opposed to the coercive measures of the government of Great Britain towards the colonies; that the finest intellects, the greatest and most eloquent statesmen that the English nation has ever produced, put forth their mightiest efforts against the commencement and prosecution of the war; such men for instance as Burke, Charles James Fox, Dempster, Wilkes and others in the House of Commons; and in the House of Lords, Lord Camden, Marquis of Rockingham, and Earl of

## The American's First Impressions 25

Chatham and many other noblemen of transcendent genius. Lord Chatham was the elder Pitt, and many years Prime Minister under George the Second and one of the greatest statesmen that the world has ever produced. The English people of that day were situated like the great mass of the German people of today, that is, deceived by the government, exploited into the war by an autocratic tyrant aided by a class of men who believed in autocratic government. George III was a pure-blooded German, believed in autocracy and the divine right of kings, and during the period of his sanity endeavored to reestablish those ancient prerogatives of the crown, the attempted exercise of which caused Charles I to lose his head. Why should the acts and the misconduct of an obstinate German autocrat, together with a subservient majority in Parliament and vacillating Prime Minister (Lord North) be attributed to the great majority of just, merciful, democratic Englishmen as their unpardonable sin? To bring the answer of that question nearer home, why should the entire present citizenship of the state of Texas be condemned for the rapacity, dishonesty and oppressive acts of the Carpet Bag Government, forced on the people after the close of the Civil War? History affords numerous

instances of governments and rulers acting contrary to the wishes and interests of the majority of the people they govern; but instances are rare where a large and intelligent class of people for a period of more than one hundred and forty years persistently condemns and denounces a whole nation of people, because of the action of a minority government of that nation many years ago against the wishes of the majority.

The misinformation or lack of information existing in the minds of many Americans in regard to the facts and conditions in England preceding and culminating in the Revolutionary War, exists also in respect to many things having a bearing upon, and resulting in the war of 1812.

From 1793 to 1807 Great Britain had been—with an interval of one or two years of feverish peace—continuously at war with France; at first with the French Republic, and later with Emperor Napoleon; in the latter year Napoleon was supreme in continental Europe, all resistance to his autocratic power had ceased, England alone was fighting him single-handed with all of Europe at his back. Twice during the period mentioned there had been combinations of the fleets of three or four of the European powers under the leadership of France for the purpose of invading Eng-

land; on each occasion the fleets were scattered by storms, whereby England was saved from invasion and subjugation. Danger to England from the combined powers of Europe was still eminent in 1807, her principal defense was her navy, thousands of her marines were deserting from the navy and obtaining employment as sailors on American merchant vessels. The laws of Great Britain prohibited a British subject from renouncing his allegiance to that government and becoming a citizen of another country, and she proceeded to impress or capture those runaway Englishmen wherever found on American vessels. The United States, long a part of Great Britain, recognized the existence of the law against expatriation, having but a short time before lived under that law, made no special objections to the reclaiming of deserters from the English navy, but objected to the insult to the flag in holding up and searching American ships; still she had no provisions for the return of those deserters in any other way.

Great Britain contended that she was fighting alone for the freedom, liberty and democracy of the world, that her subjugation would be soon followed by the conquest of America; Louisiana Territory and Canada would be retaken by Napoleon,

whose autocratic power would be finally established upon the ruins of free government; that if the United States did not choose to aid Great Britain in her struggle for the liberty of humanity from the oppression of a tyrant, she should at least cease to be a refuge and asylum for the deserters from the British navy, thereby aiding the enemy of democracy to deplete and weaken her marine forces; that if such drain on the English marine continued her warships would eventually be tied to the docks, her means of self-defense gone, leaving her helpless at the feet of Napoleon Bonaparte, whose all absorbing passions were lust for power and frenzied hate for England.

It is now, has always been, and will always be, an open question as to how far the United States was to blame for the depredations on her commerce and insult to her flag; and whether she did not in a great measure, by her pacific policy, encourage such acts, and contribute to the wrongs and injuries committed upon her, often given as a reason for her hatred for the English; and while such depredations were unjustifiable except for the very doubtful excuse furnished by exigencies of the British government, growing out of her wars with Napoleon, still as the same kind

## The American's First Impressions 29

of depredations were committed upon American commerce by France and for a longer period of time, there can be no reason for exonerating the French and condemning the English for the same character of conduct.

In rehearsing those depredations of the French—one series of which culminated in the war of 1799-1800—it is not intended to revive or excite ill-will or prejudice against that brave, patriotic, high-minded and self-sacrificing nation, for whom, in her tragic struggle for existence, the great heart of the American people now reaches out in sympathy, in admiration and affection; but such references are made merely for the purpose of exhibiting to the Anglophobist the inconsistency of condemning the act of a man or nation whom he dislikes, while approving or passing over the same thing done by another.

In the summer of 1794 a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and America tending powerfully to promote the political amity and commercial benefits of both countries. This gave great offense to France which in 1795 came under the government or misgovernment of the "Directory," one of the governing boards or bureaux that ruled France during the progress of her revolution. The treaty did not in any man-



ner discriminate against France or her commerce, but being at that time at war with Great Britain, she resented any comity or friendship between the United States and Great Britain. France seems to have felt that the aid which she had given to America during the Revolutionary war should be repaid by perpetual fealty to her; that America should not have friendly relations with any power that was at enmity with France. Even before the treaty in 1793, French privateers had commenced war on American commerce by seizing ships and cargoes on the high seas, assuming that the sense of obligation and gratitude for assistance in her struggle for independence would keep America from resenting such depredations. In the presidential contest in 1796, the French minister took a very active part to defeat Adams, the Federalist candidate—the political party responsible for the treaty with Great Britain. Failing to accomplish his defeat, France quickened her aggressive warfare on American commerce, seizing, searching, and confiscating ships, even in American waters. In retaliation, the United States at the beginning of 1799 issued letters of marque and reprisal to American privateers. After about two years of raiding on



## The American's First Impressions 31

French shipping, during which time about ninety ships were captured or destroyed by the United States cruisers and privateers, in 1800 the Directory was abolished, Napoleon became first consul, and for a time there was peace.

## CHAPTER III.

### CHOOSING AN ENEMY

WHEN Thomas Jefferson was elected President in 1800, he brought into power a party bent on reversing all of the policies of the Federalists—the party that had been in power since the government was inaugurated under the constitution—especially those that had tended to centralize power in the general government. The new party regarded a strong navy and standing army of any size as affording the Federal government a too effectual means of acquiring and holding supreme power.

In pursuance of this policy, President Jefferson and his party caused work to be suspended on the new warships that had been provided for under the previous administration; those that remained were dismantled, docked, left out of repair, with neither equipment of guns, ammunition or men. By the government's policy it invited every fourth rate power in the world to impose on its citizens and prey on its commerce on the high seas with impunity. It may well be doubted

that the British commanders would have gone to the extent of boarding American ships and arresting deserters if the United States had been provided with a fair-sized navy. The government by its policy said to American seamen: "Stay in port, don't venture beyond the three-mile limit at sea; if you do, it will be at your own peril. Your welfare does not justify the risk of increasing Federal power, by building and equipping warships, and maintaining crews and marines to man them." What kind of treatment could the United States expect that her citizens would receive from the other nations, when she exhibited such small concern for their welfare? Though such indifference to their protection did not justify Great Britain in her encroachments, still, when this and all other circumstances are weighed, such as the national peril to Great Britain made eminent by the attitude of nearly all European nations, the natural instinct of self-defense and self-preservation which no man-made law can restrict or circumscribe, many grounds can be found that will in some degree mitigate her offense. In view of international law as recognized in the year 1807, these acts of Great Britain in reclaiming the deserters from her navy, should not be regarded as justifying the hatred for the English

to continue for more than one hundred years. After all, they were not more offensive than the conduct of Captain Wilkes, commander of an American man-of-war, in over-hauling the English steamer Trent and forcibly taking and removing Slidell and Mason, Confederate commissioners on their way to Europe as passengers on the Trent.

It is one of the unaccountable and anomalous phases of human nature that so many Southern people—ex-confederate soldiers and their descendants—should entertain illwill and dislike for England, in the face of undisputed history that the most influential classes in England were known to sympathize with the South during the Civil War; and that she came near going to war with the United States on account of the Slidell and Mason incident. Yet among the bitterest English haters today many are to be found in the Southern states.

The depredation on American commerce by Great Britain was one of the proximate causes of the war in 1812. In 1803 war again broke out between France and England and it was not long before each nation, England by her orders in council, and Napoleon by his decrees, established paper blockades of all the ports of each

other, which included every port on the Mediterranean Sea, European ports on the Atlantic Ocean and Baltic Sea, and sea-ports of Great Britain. Napoleon by his decrees ordered his cruisers and privateers to capture and confiscate the ships of any neutral nation that had stopped at an English port, or had goods of English manufacture in their cargoes. England by her orders in council made practically the same restrictions with reference to neutral trade with France and her allies. The United States being the only neutral nation having any commerce whatever was thus caught between the upper and nether millstones. Those orders and decrees were not directed specially against the United States, but the practical effect amounted to a declaration of war by both nations against America. From the year 1806, when these orders and decrees were first made, to the fall of Napoleon in 1814, which also included the full period of the war in 1812, marked the weakest, most humiliating, and most disgraceful period of American history. Having done everything possible to weaken the hands of the general government, having dismantled the navy, reduced the regular army to a force of 6,000 men, having cut down the annual revenue to barely sufficient to support

the government on a peace basis, the government was suddenly confronted with the dire necessity of having, and exercising for the defense of the country, the very powers of the Federal government that had been destroyed by the Jefferson administration. The only measure of redress or reprisal left to the United States, and for the protection of her shipping, was to place an embargo on the shipment of any kind of freight whatever from the United States to any country in the world, and prohibit the exit of any American owned ships. This embargo produced such a storm of protest from the people as not only to demoralize the government but seriously threaten the Union itself. New England objected because it ruined her commerce and left her ships to decay at the docks, her maritime population without employment. The Middle and Southern states complained because they were deprived by the embargo of a foreign market for their agricultural products.

Discontent and dissatisfaction and resentment towards the government increased; a plan was formed in New England, at the instigation of the Federalists, to nullify the embargo and resist the enforcement of the law, which would necessarily cause secession and result in a union or com-

mercial alliance with England. John Quincy Adams, Senator from Massachusetts, who had left the Federalist party, came to Washington to counsel the President and warn him of the temper and trend of affairs in New England.

At the beginning of 1809, Congress substituted for the embargo the Non-Intercourse Act which permitted commerce with all nations except France and England and their allies, and as there was little or no commerce between the United States and the other neutral nations the Act served no purpose, except by lifting the embargo to turn loose American ships to engage in the old and respectable crime of smuggling. Finding that the smuggling, which took the place of open trade with France and England, cut off the revenue derived by the government from the tariff, Congress after eighteen months' trial repealed the Non-Intercourse act, and the United States fell back once more upon negotiations with the two countries to repeal their several orders and decrees. England refused to revoke her orders prohibiting neutrals from trading with France; Napoleon agreed to revoke his decrees prohibiting neutral trading with England and notified President Jefferson that he had in fact done so. This influenced many hundreds of ships with

valuable cargoes consisting principally of goods of English manufacture to be sent to France and to the ports of her allies. As soon, however, as they entered those ports they were seized and confiscated with their cargoes, the wily Emperor claiming that his decrees were still in force. The loss to the American owners from such deceitful artifices amounted to quite ten million dollars in one season. For more than two years longer matters continued to grow worse, with a growing certainty that war was inevitable either with England or France. The United States was too weak to fight both, or either one of them singly, for that matter. She was in the attitude of a trembling scared boy placed by his companions in a ring with two husky bullies, his retreat cut off, and compelled to fight one of the bullies, with an absolute certainty of getting a licking whichever one he picked on. The author is recounting a sad and actual experience of his boyhood days, which enables him to describe accurately the sensations and travails of soul of President Madison and Congress for the next two years or more. Without a navy, without an army, without armament, munitions, money, revenue or credit, the United States strove manfully to keep out of war. She tried the Non-In-



tercourse act again on both nations, but it would not work. Meantime she was trying in all good faith and sincerity to decide which one of the two nations was the safest for her to fight. Hereditary dislike for England and love for France finally decided the question, and while it was admitted that Napoleon had done far more to injure America than England had, on June 18, 1812, war was declared against Great Britain. True to the bad luck that seemed to have dogged the administrations of Jefferson and Madison in their foreign relations, the President soon learned that on the day before Congress declared war, England had revoked her orders in Council which had given such offense to the United States; and about the same time it was learned that a few weeks previously a French fleet had been sent to sea for the purpose of capturing or destroying all American ships and sweeping her commerce from the high seas. But it was too late to recall the declaration of war; America had turned loose her little navy of seven frigates and a few small brigs on British commerce and on her innumerable men-of-war. Congress had authorized the President to increase the army from six to twenty-five thousand men, and to call for fifty thousand volunteers, but it absolutely refused to

levy any taxes or otherwise provide means to carry on the war.

The financial centers of the country were the commercial cities on the Atlantic coasts, but the government adopted the fatuous policy of putting another embargo on all the shipping in all of those cities; this produced a perfect furore among the moneyed men of the nation, and when the government endeavored to float a loan with these financiers to raise money to prosecute the war it was incontinently turned down, its agents snubbed with the suggestion that they could not aid a government that had a habit of ruining their trade by its embargoes.

Recruiting for the regular army and the volunteer contingent progressed slowly: men could not serve without pay and find themselves. With no money or credit, war munitions insufficient in quantity and quality, with but little field artillery, the enemy rapidly assembling on the Canadian frontier, sea ports being blockaded by hostile squadrons, dissension among the people opposed to the war and dissatisfied with the government, negotiating with the enemy for the purpose of placing themselves once more under British rule, surely the outlook for the young nation was bleak and disheartening. The progress of events

brought no improvement. Some of the New England states refused to allow their militia to serve beyond the limits of the respective states, whereupon it was necessary for the government to withdraw the regular troops from the stations on the New England coast, thereby exposing the whole coast to occupation by the British.

The battles on land resulted in ignominious defeat of the Americans. Three efforts to invade Canada failed and the Americans were driven back with heavy losses. General Hull surrendered Detroit with 2,500 Americans to a British force numbering about one half of the American troops under his command.

General Ross with four thousand men captured the city of Washington, and all the public buildings were burned to the ground. 2,000 Americans defending the city, scurried away at the first contact with the British with a loss of one man killed. The fall and abdication of Napoleon on April 4, 1814, and his banishment to Elba, released from service in Europe the large armies of British veterans that had been thoroughly trained and seasoned for warfare in the sanguinary wars of Napoleon. The naval forces that had been employed by Napoleon against England were now her allies, and she was therefore able to turn

her entire strength, navy and land forces, to the war against the United States. Her navy subdivided into squadrons blockaded the main ports of America, and began a series of raids and incursions on coast towns and adjacent country. Her land forces were placed along the Canadian frontiers in strength sufficient to repel American invasions, as well as to raid American territory. Her mode of warfare was confined to raids and incursions at widely separated and isolated points; keeping the American army scattered and gradually exhausting its energy, making forced marches from point to point to meet and repel these numerous incursions, extending for more than one thousand miles along the Canadian border, and four or five thousand miles of coast line extending from Maine to the mouth of the Mississippi River, it was impossible for the United States to furnish adequate protection to the vast extended border and coast line, and the inhabitants of the harried districts complained bitterly at what they regarded as the neglect of their government to protect them. In parts of New England the feeling assumed a rebellious tone; secession was openly threatened by the Federalists, who were strongly pro-British. The Legislature of Massachusetts called a convention of New

England States and New York, which met in secret session and agreed on proceedings looking to a union with Great Britain. The island of Nantucket declared neutrality and placed itself under British protection.

While the American land forces were victorious in several battles along the Canadian border, these victories did not counterbalance the losses they had suffered from British victories, and accomplished nothing except to hearten the Americans and restore confidence in their fighting abilities. The American navy achieved brilliant victories in Lake Erie and Lake Champlain, and were generally victorious in the fights between a single American ship with a British man-of-war, but these victories did nothing towards breaking the British blockade or bringing the war any nearer to an end.

The outlook for America in December, 1814, was recognized by both nations to be bleak and discouraging. No progress to end the war would ever be made until the United States finally fell to pieces by the sheer dissatisfaction of her own people; forming small republics, each making its own peace, as New England was then about to do. It was at this crisis that the Government of Great Britain displayed a mag-

nanimity, kindness and consideration towards the United States that could not be expected of her under all the circumstances or even required by the customs and usages of nations at war. The declaration of war by the United States on the 18th of June, 1812, was without justification. In the language of a reliable and distinguished American historian, "the cause of the war at the very eve of its outbreak had been taken away," and again, "The risk of the war was not worse than its deep impolicy," and "It was a foolhardy and reckless risk the Congress was taking" in declaring war, and further "The grounds of the war were singularly uncertain." Another distinguished American historian has written: "The declaration of war by America seemed an act of sheer madness."

Instead of waiting for the vanquished nation to sue for peace as was the custom, and at a time when America was practically helpless and hopeless to bring to a successful issue the war that she had started, Great Britain held out to her enemy the olive branch of peace. The offer was promptly and gladly accepted by the United States, resulting on December 24, 1814, in the Ghent treaty of peace that has lasted to this day.

The generosity and broadmindedness of Great

Britain were never displayed to a greater degree than in waiving all claim for indemnity either in money or in territorial concessions. The custom and usages of nations has always recognized the right of a victorious nation to exact and receive such an indemnity from her vanquished enemy, to reimburse her for costs, expenses and losses incident to a war. Even those who are biased in favor of America are bound to admit that Great Britain was justly and fairly entitled to indemnity for losses occasioned by that war. At a time when she was straining every nerve, employing every resource in her desperate struggle for the benefit of mankind against the scourge of Europe, single handed and alone, staggering under the weight of debts and privations of more than twenty years of almost constant warfare, she needed and deserved at least the sympathy, if not the active aid, of every English-speaking people. Instead, our government, by what was claimed by the people of New England to be an inexcusable accident prompted by hereditary dislike for England, precipitated an unnecessary war and added to the burdens and distress of the English people, who felt that their nation had been struck in the back by those who "were indeed of their own tribes and families." At the opening of hos-



tilities the United States was the aggressor, her navy began the destruction of British ships and her land forces invaded Canada before Great Britain could prepare to meet her new enemy. During the progress of that war hundreds of British warships and merchant craft were destroyed, thousands of British seamen and marines at sea, and British soldiers on land, lost their lives. The war had cost Great Britain millions of dollars.

Never before or since has a conquering nation shown to her vanquished enemy such liberality in the face of such uncalled for provocations and injuries. Even in later periods of the world's history indemnities have been exacted against the unsuccessful nation, even when no war had actually taken place. Germany in recent years annexed the city and seaport of Kiao Chau in China and the inlet of Sausah as a coaling station during the year 1897, as indemnity for the murder of two German missionaries; and from France she exacted about one billion dollars besides the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine as indemnity for losses and outlay resulting from the Franco-Prussian war. The United States received from Mexico a cession of a vast territory at the close of the Mexican war, and while it was ostensibly

sold to the United States for twenty-five million dollars, the value of the territory was far in excess of that sum, which excess constituted a princely indemnity. So in the cession of the Philippines, Porto Rico, and other islands to the United States by Spain at the close of the Spanish-American war, the actual value of the territory ceded was many times more than the twenty millions paid to Spain for it, which excess constituted a large indemnity. England therefore could, in good faith, and in accordance with the universal usages of nations, have demanded indemnity from the United States, and could have easily enforced it. New England was ready and anxious like over-ripe fruit to drop into her hand, and the United States was without power to coerce her back into the union. The secession of New England and her retention by Great Britain as indemnity, would in the course of time have resulted in the dissolution of the union, or, at least, would have arrested national development, and delayed, if not prevented, the fulfillment of the grand destiny of the American people that is now unfolding itself to the enraptured vision of the world.

Uninfluenced by any feeling of malice or revenge growing out of the war, Great Britain re-

nounced her right and power to dismember the United States by demanding territorial indemnity or by affiliating the New England states.

It is deplorable that the public speakers and writers in America, especially writers of our school histories and boards that select them, should have always regarded it as unpatriotic to mention the blunders and mistakes of our ancestors, carefully omitting the mention of any historical incident, however true, or material that would be calculated to moderate our national conceit or cause disagreeable emotions in the minds of young Americans; they have consistently refused to suggest in behalf of other people that have been at war with us any candid and favorable circumstances. The unhappy result of this partial and unfair teaching and history can never be more aptly exemplified than in the United States yielding to the national and hereditary dislike emplanting and cultivated in the mind of the American people against England by American writers and speakers, and declaring war against her instead of France—a war that cost the United States thousands of lives and millions of dollars; a war that accomplished nothing except to increase the dislike of

the two English-speaking peoples for each other. If the war had been declared against France it would have been merely a naval warfare, with every advantage to the United States, and would have ceased upon the fall of Napoleon Bonaparte.

## CHAPTER IV.

### BLOOD IS THICKER THAN WATER

ORDINARILY a proper and unbiased consideration of the facts of history which exhibit the good will and kind feeling of the people of England for America during the past century should overcome the dislike and prejudice in the minds of Americans against Great Britain caused by the teaching of American orators and historians described in the preceding chapters; but with many, the first impressions on this subject have become unchangeable opinions in hearing the same thing repeated so often, and never disputed by any one. Many elderly Americans of pure English descent can be found who declare their dislike for England and admit that they do not know the particular reasons for such dislike, except as they have heard in early life the spread-eagle speeches of those Fourth of July orators. They admit that they have always disliked England; but also declare their respect (and as to some individuals their real affection) for the English people that have settled in America.

There is some excuse for and consideration to be shown for this class of anti-English Americans; custom and environment over which they have no control conspired to embitter them against Great Britain. I confess that until I was forty-five years old, I had the same intense prejudice against the Old Country. I recall listening to one of those spread-eagle orators when I was a boy. How he lambasted the English and twisted the tail of the English lion, and made the American eagle scream! He stamped and foamed and roared, turned red in the face and shook his fist in the direction he supposed England to be. He personally defied the entire British empire and dared it individually and collectively just to put one foot on American soil as an invader. The orator was a heavy-set, squatty little man, but to boyish admiring eyes he loomed up like a giant. The boys who listened to that speech were worked up into a perfect frenzy of patriotism and hatred for England. For myself, I felt that I had been mistreated by Providence in not being permitted to be born in time to be a Revolutionary soldier, and feared that there would not be another war with England in my lifetime.

These chapters are especially dedicated to this

class of English-hating Americans and their descendants, because I know from my own experience how they came to feel that way.

The other groups of Anglophobists, described hereafter, are far beyond the reach of argument or reason; they are perfectly incorrigible, and as to them this discussion does no good, except to counteract the effect of their statements and influence.

We can all remember how the heart of the American people warmed towards the English when we heard how the British jackies and marines on British ships in Hong Kong harbor cheered and hurrahed for the Americans as Dewey's fleet steamed out for Manila under orders to "capture the Spanish fleet or destroy it." We all regarded the incident as showing how the English people would side in the war then starting, and that it showed that "blood is thicker than water." Within one week after war was declared against Spain, Great Britain declared her neutrality, which was quickly followed by all other European powers excepting Germany. There is no longer any doubt that at that time Germany had already or intended to form an alliance with Spain and join the war against the United States. This was proven, in a measure,



by the conduct of Admiral Deiterich, commanding a German fleet at Manila Bay. Immediately after the destruction of the Spanish fleet, Commodore Dewey laid siege to the city of Manila. On the arrival of the German fleet, after the battle, Admiral Deiterich anchored his flagship between Dewey's fleet and the City of Manila. The rules of naval warfare prohibited neutral vessels from placing themselves between a belligerent fleet and a city it was besieging. The German admiral ignored this rule, but was ordered by Dewey to remove his vessel. Deiterich leisurely and with apparent reluctance complied with the order. The next morning he returned to the same place. Dewey again ordered him to "get out and stay out," adding that if he "wanted to fight he would get it," and began to clear for action. The German retired and soon left the bay. It has since developed that a secret treaty between Spain and Germany provided for a transfer of the Philippine Islands to Germany in the event of war between Spain and the United States, because Spain felt that she would be unable to hold them in case of such a war. The presence of the German fleet was to take possession of those islands, and Deiterich's action was a feeler to see how far he could go, and also to

communicate with the Spanish authorities in Manila. The excellent marksmanship of the American gunners firing at the Spanish fleet a few days previously no doubt is one good reason why the German admiral hesitated to accept Dewey's invitation to fight. Before he received instructions from the Kaiser, Great Britain quietly gave Germany to understand that she, Great Britain, was prepared to enter the war as an ally of the United States in the event that Germany formed a war alliance with Spain.

Only since the beginning of the European war has it been possible for Americans to realize the awful and sickening possibilities to the United States that would have quickly developed if Germany had allied with Spain in the Spanish war, Great Britain remaining neutral. We all realized at the time, with national terror, how helpless the eighty millions of the people of the United States were for warfare on land; a mere handful of regulars and a volunteer army of men without training, equipment, experienced officers, provisions, transportation or modern armament, with 4,000 miles or more of coast line vulnerable to the enemy. For naval warfare we had a fourth-class fleet, and that divided, nearly one-half at Manila, 12,000 miles away from the other

half; the coast line and sea-board cities were practically without defense.

The present war has taught us something about German preparedness for war during the past forty odd years. As far back as forty-seven years ago they were able to place 325,000 men on the French frontier within eighteen days after the declaration of war by France, well equipped, well provisioned, trained and officered, and within a few weeks were able to crush the French army; and within five days after the declaration of the present war by Germany she had 500,000 well trained soldiers on the march toward the frontier of Luxemburg and Belgium supplied with the latest improved armament. In the year of 1898 she was well prepared for war, as in 1914. She had the second greatest navy in the world. The United States navy at that time was classed as the fourth. Almost the entire merchant marine of Germany was subsidized and therefore subject to be used by the Germans as transports, or to be converted into cruisers in the event of a war. The Spanish navy after destruction of eleven vessels at Manila comprised six ships under the command of Admiral Cervera, and about that many more under the command of Admiral Carama. Our North Atlantic fleet

was divided into two squadrons, one under the command of Admiral Schley guarding the coast of New England, the other, under Admiral Sampson, scouting the South Atlantic coasts of the United States.

We can all remember the panic of the American people near the coasts on the Atlantic and the Gulf of Mexico when it was learned that the Spanish squadron, under Cervera, had left the Azores Islands and sailed westerly towards the United States; there was no wireless telegraphy in those days, and there was no way to ascertain what part of the long coast-line from the Rio Grande, by way of Key West to the north-east corner of Maine, the Spanish would strike.

With three times as many warships as the American Atlantic fleet numbered; with more than one hundred and fifty transports at their command; the ability of Germany to mobilize in a short time her army and navy; the total unpreparedness of the United States; her Atlantic fleet divided into two squadrons; widely separated; it is not difficult to summarize the disasters to our country in a coalition of Germany and Spain, and continued neutrality of Great Britain, and it goes without saying that they could have easily landed a large army at almost any point on

the Gulf or Atlantic coast that suited their purpose. Once landed and intrenched on a line selected by the trained military genius of German officers; supported by developed artillery and rapid firing guns; defended by infantry of that stubborn, sullen courage that makes the German soldiers apparently indifferent to danger or death; armed with the newest and most destructive patterns of rifles: the ability of the United States army, composed of untrained volunteers, to drive the enemy out of the country would be scarcely possible.

The usual tactics of American troops at that period, as well as that of the British, two years later in the Boer war, was to charge the enemy whenever he was encountered, and with but little knowledge or examination of the ground over which the charge was made. This method worked successfully at San Juan Hill in Cuba, though at a loss to the Americans in killed and wounded of about sixteen hundred men in less than four hours of fighting; the Spanish loss was about fifteen hundred in that battle. The reckless courage of the American troops; the strange want of care in the commanding officers in ascertaining the nature of the ground and obstacles and dangers the troops were encountering in that

charge, are best shown in the following extract from the official report of General Shafter on that engagement:

“After completing their formation under a destructive fire and advancing a short distance, both divisions found a wide bottom in which had been placed barbed-wire entanglements, and beyond which the enemy was strongly posted. Nothing daunted, these gallant men pushed on to drive the enemy from his chosen position,” etc.

And there you have the American tactics of 1898. Charging like mad bulls as soon as they could see the enemy or learn his position; without knowledge or care of barbed-wire entanglements or exposure to the enemy's fire; no clearing or opening up a way by artillery fire or forethought; what would such reckless tactics mean to American untrained volunteer troops charging a German army entrenched and prepared as heretofore indicated? It would mean to them suicide, slaughter, butchery; it would mean windrows and heaps of American dead and wounded soldiers.

## CHAPTER V.

### UNPREPAREDNESS VERSUS READINESS

To illustrate further and emphasize the danger to the United States of the threatened coalition of Germany and Spain in the Spanish war of 1898, it may be proper to cite additional facts showing the unpreparedness of our government. On February 15th, about two months before the declaration of war, the battleship Maine was blown up in Havana Harbor; both nations realized then that war was inevitable. The government of the United States, recognizing its utter want of preparation and desiring to postpone actual hostilities until some preparation could be made, instructed the minister to Spain, General Stewart L. Woodford, to use every effort to keep Spain quiet until the middle of April.

The following is an extract from an authentic statement made by General Woodford, written soon after the war: "The weeks drifted by and February 15th, 1898, came, when our battleship was blown up in the harbor of Havana. Through departments other than the State Department, I



received telegraphic information on February 18th that there was not on American ships or in the ordnance depots more than two rounds of powder per gun or per man. I was therefore told to exhaust the arts of peace until April 15th, the earliest date at which we could be any where near ready for war, and that in any event smokeless powder for both navy and the army would be another impossibility. I did the best I could, but let me inform you that if it had not been for the unfaltering, unchanging and loyal friendship of England, and the attitude of her minister at Madrid, I might have failed to do the little I did do, because the representatives at Madrid of Continental Europe were ready at any time to interfere with the plans of the United States if the British minister would only join them."

At the time that war was declared, April 19, 1898, the standing army of the United States did not exceed 28,000 men of all arms. On April 23rd, President McKinley issued a call for 125,000 volunteers, and on May 25 he issued another call for 75,000 more, aggregating 200,000. The time necessary to recruit, concentrate, equip, train and get this volunteer army in fighting shape has been variously estimated at from three to six months. Assuming that it could all be

done in three months, the question still remains, would that be in time to check a German invasion of this country if it was attempted? This question can best be answered by again alluding to some of the incidents of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. As I have already stated, the German government was able to mobilize on the French frontier within eighteen days after the declaration of war 325,000 troops. Three days later the French had an army of 300,000 well trained and well equipped troops on that frontier. The French were prepared for the war. Their arsenals were full of ammunition. The army was well supplied with Chassepot guns, a rapid-firing weapon, and with a new weapon called the mitrailleuse, which could fire twenty-five bullets at a time; notwithstanding these advantages and preparations, the French army never recovered from the disadvantage of being three days longer than the Germans in mobilizing. The strong drive of the German army broke through the French line, and within two months and three days after the declaration of war the German troops had surrounded and begun the siege of the city of Paris, after which the defeat and destruction of the remaining armies of France became a matter of mere detail. Twenty-

seven years passed, leading up to the Spanish-American war. The speedy and complete success in the war with France, the billion dollar reward as indemnity and acquisition of Alsace and German Lorraine, the consolidation of all the German states, kingdoms and principalities into one mighty empire, evolved in the brain of the German rulers the dreams of world-wide domination.

That they were casting covetous looks at South American territory was evidenced by the ominous growl of the old war-dog Bismarck, when he denounced the Monroe Doctrine as the "most arrogant piece of national impudence that was ever uttered." During this period the standing army and navy of the empire was gradually increased in size and efficiency; her war-chest filled with gold; arms and ammunition of the latest improved kind constantly on hand; her wonderful system of espionage and secret service, permeating and exploring the territory of every nation or country in Europe and America, and portions of Asia and Africa, including that of her allies—learning the topography, military secrets and strength and preparedness of each, their revenues, warships, harbors, fortifications, and a thousand other details that might be useful in the

future domination, conquest or destruction of these countries or nationalities that the interest of the empire might require. And how about the United States during all those twenty-seven years? A great, big-hearted nation, open-minded, with no military, naval or diplomatic secrets of her own, and not desiring to know those of other nations; unsuspecting, friendly and peaceful, her people charitable and sympathetic, handing out their countless thousands of dollars to relieve the stricken and distressed in every part of the world. Brave, high-minded America; her guns rusting, ammunition exhausted, every increase of her navy begrudged and opposed by a demagogue faction in Congress. What chance would she have had in a conflict with Germany with her standing army of near a half million of well-trained soldiers at the time of the Spanish war, with more than a million well-trained reservists within military age who had already served their time of enlistment? I answer that question by asking another—what chance would that peaceful, big-hearted giant have as he walked abroad, a kindly smile lighting up his features, his hands in his pockets to hand out alms to the needy beggar, meeting a low-browed enemy with revolvers strapped to his waist, murder in his heart,

quick to draw and of deadly aim, hunting his victim?

What really happened, and what might have resulted to the two countries if England had not quietly intimated to Germany, "hands off," will be developed hereafter.

Having shown how well prepared Germany was for an invasion of the United States if she had entered the war as an ally of Spain in 1898, and how unprepared the United States was to resist such invasion, it is proper to investigate the motives and purposes, if any, of the German Government in entering into a coalition with Spain, and the reason, if any, why she would desire to prosecute a destructive war against a peaceful nation; a nation for which she had always professed good-will and friendship; a nation with which so many thousands of her own people had affiliated as citizens. The great incentive to such a course can be found in the bitter and cruel hatred excited in the minds of the governing classes of Germany against any nationality that opposed or in any manner interfered with her schemes or plans for dominating and Germanizing the world. A striking illustration of such a disposition is found in the difference in their treatment of the Grand Duchy of

Luxemburg and the kingdom of Belgium by the Teutonic rulers during the present European war. At the commencement of the war the friendship of Germany for the two countries was the same. The young Grand Duchess of Luxemburg strongly and vigorously protested against the violation of the neutrality of her country by the passage of German troops through it, but offered no resistance, and the lives, liberty and property of her people were not destroyed or materially impaired by the Germany army. Belgium resisted the violation of her neutrality and the devastation and ruin of her country and people followed. The German war policy of "frightfulness" adopted and pursued by her ostensibly to terrify and intimidate the Belgians and suppress resistance was in fact prompted by feelings of revenge and hatred engendered by the Belgian resistance. The hatred of Germany for England concentrated and expressed in her national "Hymn of Hate" was not on account of losses in killed and wounded at, before and after the battle of the Marne, but because she was thwarted by England in her desire to establish naval bases on the North Sea and English Channel by the conquest of Belgium and North-eastern France; by checking the aspirations of Germany through her line

of railway to Bagdad, to control the trade of Persia, Afghanistan and eventually India; and also by supporting and upholding the Monroe Doctrine of the United States; as well as because of England's superior navy, commercial rivalry, etc. The vigorous colonial policy instigated by Bismark was his favorite scheme to promote world-wide domination of the empire; but this colonial policy came too late to accomplish that purpose; all of the desirable and available territory of the world for colonization had long been annexed by other European powers; the only territory that Germany would be able to annex was portions of East and West Africa, the territory of Kiau-Chau in China and a few islands in the Pacific Ocean. The vast fertile region in South America practically unoccupied—described in part by ex-President Roosevelt in his account of his recent explorations of South America—was denied to her by the hated Monroe doctrine. In the absence of that doctrine, how easy with Germany's perfection of statecraft and intrigue and wealth would it have been for her to interfere in, or manipulate the revolutions that were always existing in these unhappy countries, to her own advantage; thereby either acquiring territory or establishing such an influence as would



amount to actual ownership. How easy to have acquired control of the bankrupt French company and built and controlled the Panama Canal, enabling her to extend her influence and power to the western republics of Chile, Peru, and Ecuador. How easy to acquire by purchase or conquest Cuba and Porto Rico from the feeble and decaying Spanish government. It is impossible even for the dullest intellect not to perceive the vast and wonderful possibilities for expansion, territorial, political, financial and commercial, that would be offered to the German government by the abrogation of the Monroe Doctrine. As well would it be impossible for even the strongest intellect to conceive or summarize all of these possibilities and advantages; the ordinary mind staggers at the attempt to grasp them.

When Germany declined to proclaim her neutrality in the Spanish-American war, it foreshadowed conclusively that she would take a part in that war, as ally to one of the other belligerents. Everything goes to show that it is not the United States, but Spain, that she proposed to help. Outside of the proof furnished by the conduct of the commander of the German fleet at Manila Bay, and of her representative at Madrid disclosed by ex-Minister Woodford, her secret



hatred for the United States growing out of the bar to her ambition by reason of the Monroe Doctrine, existing up to and evidenced by her secret intrigue with Mexico and Japan, was amply sufficient to show whose ally she proposed to be in that war. It cannot be said that at and before the commencement of that war she had not accurately sized up the situation and her certainty of being able to defeat the American army, as it then existed. It is not possible that she could be blind to all the advantages accruing to her by such an alliance, if Great Britain remained neutral. Any person making such an assertion, shows that he has been utterly oblivious of current and recent history exhibiting the singleness of purpose of the German government, its miraculous foresightedness, its supernatural intrigue, and espionage, its diabolical ingenuity in preparing means, weapons and occasions for the destruction of human life; such a critic in his blind admiration for German "Kultur" shows that he has been in a state of somnambulism since August, 1914, a sleep-walker, passing through life perfectly and wilfully oblivious to events and happenings that even inanimate nature has responded to.

## CHAPTER VI.

### IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN

AN effort has been made in the preceding chapters to summarize the military conditions of this country as they existed at the beginning of the Spanish-American war in the spring of 1898, as well as the attitude of the German government toward that war, and her preparedness and absolute certainty of victory if she concluded to intervene in behalf of Spain—Great Britain remaining neutral—pointing out the strong inducements, reasons and motives urging her to form a coalition with Spain; her desire and at one time her bona-fide intention to do so.

This leads to a recital of the supposed or hypothetical conflict between Germany and the United States, and the invasion of the latter country by the armies of Germany and Spain, the defeat of the Americans and occupation of portions of the country; and in the light of the fate of Belgium and North France since their occupation by the German army, to state in part the particular disasters, suffering and ruin to the people of our

country by such invasion and military occupation. The savage cruelty and barbarity attendant upon German conquest of a country in 1914 would have attended such a conquest in 1898. What she did to the helpless people of Belgium and France, she was ready and anxious to do to the people of the United States in 1898 if she had the chance. The same conditions exciting the hatred, malice and revenge of the German ruling military caste existed at each period. For want of an opportunity to exhibit the fiendish blood-thirsty nature of a certain type of German officers and soldiers, mankind had no conception of it until it was exhibited in the tragedies that quickly followed the occupation of Belgium and Northern France. The type referred to is separate and distinct from the kindly, peaceable and industrious class of Germans who affiliate readily with the democracy of the countries to which they migrate and often become the trusted friends and neighbors of Americans. This type differs from the pure-blooded German physically, mentally, and morally. They are easily recognizable by their sullen, brutal faces, flat heads and cruel expression indicative of their Hunnish origin. They have no more humanity than the gorilla; they would shoot down their own fathers, mo-

thers, children, or brothers, if ordered to do so by those in command of them. The Huns who conquered the German tribes of Central and Western Europe in the fifth century were not Germans but Kalmucks, or Monguls from Central Asia. In the invasion they were led by Attila the Great, called the "Scourge of God" because of the inhuman savage barbarities committed by his followers. Although they settled in the conquered territory and mingled and interbred with the conquered German tribes the two races never amalgamated; the Mogul breed still reverts to type, although infused with the blood of other races. In many sections of Prussia the Hunnish type predominates. It is, and has always been, the chief support of Kaiserism, and militarism, the willing and bloody tools of tyrants; the Prussian instrumentality of "frightfulness." With officers of the same breed they are left to garrison the towns and villages of the territory overrun by the German troops, while the best and bravest of the army go to the front. It is this kind of armed and trained creatures of German ambition that would have been detailed to garrison the cities, towns and villages of the United States in 1898 if this country had been invaded.

It might not be improper at this point for the benefit of the Anglophobist of English descent to visualize as happening in America some of the horrible atrocities committed on the helpless people of Belgium and North France by those Prussian garrisons. Take the ordinary American town or village, inhabited by refined and educated people; raised in an atmosphere of freedom and liberty, safe under the protection of law and officers from injury and imposition, the young men independent, self-respecting and brave, young ladies of the usual American beauty and culture; the people all at peace, living in luxurious homes, elegantly furnished; comforts and luxuries of life in abundance. Perhaps it is your condition, Mr. Anglophobist, and no doubt you have in mind the individuals just described, or people like them. You hear the dull roar of distant cannonading; it comes nearer. You see bodies of American volunteer troops passing through retreating; then the dark grey uniforms of the Teuton soldiers who pass on leaving a garrison of demons to carry out the amiable will of the beloved Kaiser, which means inaugurating an orgy of crime, robbery, arson, and looting; old men and women ranged up against a stone wall and shot by a platoon of soldiers on some pre-

text, houses blown up or burned after looting, young ladies dragged away, never to be heard of again; the highways crowded with frightened fugitives fleeing from the wrath of the invader; old men tottering along with the aged wife; little children, some of them mere babies, their parents dead or vanished, with pitiful little bundles of clothing, tired, hungry, thirsty, crying, sleeping and dying by the road-side. Man can think and write or speak of tragedies like those of Belgium five thousand miles off in an impersonal way, with sorrow, and sympathy for the unfortunate; but when it comes to thinking of such things happening to our own people, our horror becomes unspeakable. The fate of one town such as I have described would have been that of five hundred or one thousand other American towns that would have been occupied by the German army if she had invaded the country as an ally of Spain.

The atrocities mentioned are not merely imaginary or manufactured for effect; each of them has occurred in Belgium and France, and hundreds of other kinds, times without number in scores of places, so brutal, fiendish and cruel as would move the recording Angel to throw down his pen in disgust at the horror of it.

Not the least of all the calamities to the United States of such a German invasion would have been the terrible loss in killed and wounded to our army in battles with the German troops. I do not underestimate the courage of Americans, but without organization, training and proper equipment, such courage would not only be useless, but would in fact lend aid to their destruction. The wail of distress and cries for help coming from stricken towns and country writhing under the cruelty and oppressions of the Hunnish brutes would have aroused the American manhood to perfect frenzy; and totally unfitted them for the training and preparation that would enable them to cope with the enemy; causing them to rush upon the enemy without organization, poorly armed, to be cut down like grass by a reaper, their bodies piled up like cord-wood before German trenches.

The moral to be deduced from thus stressing the evils that threatened our country in 1898 is, that those calamities were averted by Great Britain through her friendship for, and stand taken, in behalf of the United States, and which caused Germany to give up her purposes. There are thousands of middle-aged Americans who today owe their lives to England; men who would have



been slaughtered by the Germans in the war prevented by Great Britain. And it is a sad reflection upon the gratitude they owed to England, that eighteen months afterwards when the Boer war broke out many mass meetings were held in many places in the United States for the purpose of expressing sympathy with the Boers and denouncing England, and thousands of Americans made their way to South Africa to enlist in the Boer army, many of whom would have died by German bullets a year and a half before in America, but for the English. And it is a monument to the magnanimity of the British that whenever they took any of these American prisoners, instead of sending them to prison camps they would offer to parole them and give them transportation back to America.

Soon after the Boer war I was told by an intelligent English physician that although England made no complaint of the actions of Americans in siding against her, nothing in the history of all her foreign relations had ever happened that hurt the great heart of the English people like that display of ingratitude by Americans.

The destruction of life and property in the United States, just mentioned, and the suffering of the people, attendant upon a German invasion



in 1898, although far greater than described, are things that could all be effaced by the lapse of time; a new generation of people would live, the destroyed cities and towns rebuilt—the physical scars of the war would be healed over in a generation or two, and its great calamities would live only in history and tradition; the murdered people and those who mourned them all reunited in the spirit-land; but the effect of such a war upon governments, nationalities and human liberty terminating in Teutonic victory and defeat of the United States army, would outlast the present civilization of the world. It would have changed the maps of North and South America, and would have opened up a short road to world domination to the Germans. It would have left the United States without a navy, burdened for a generation with a war indemnity, an indemnity which would have been not less than three billion dollars; •three times that exacted of France in 1871, which would have been no harder on the United States, as the wealth of France in 1871 was not one-third of the wealth of the United States in 1898. With this vast sum of money Germany would be able in a short time to construct the greatest navy in the world; with the Monroe Doctrine abrogated and forever renounced by the

United States, which would have been one of the terms of peace exacted of her by the conquering Teutons, the German Empire would commence its policy of expansion under the most favorable conditions. To forestall any obstacles that the people of the United States might thereafter interpose to such expansion in America, she would doubtless, as she has recently suggested to Mexico, have restored to Mexico the territory taken from her in 1848, as well as that lost by the independence of Texas, which would necessarily become German territory or under her suzerainty, as it would soon be found to be impossible for Mexico to hold it against the American inhabitants, into which territory would be invited all of the disaffected elements in the United States, including the hyphenates, the Teutonic, the pro-German and Anglophobists. These elements, especially the last named, could then have had the opportunity of comparing existence under the common law of England in force in the United States, with German autocracy and militarism, enforced by bayonets in the hands of those amiable and mild mannered Huns.

When one listens sometimes to the ill-considered babble of some of the pro-German Americans, slurring at England and the United States,

he conceives a half formed wish that such an individual might have a taste of German "Kultur" by being compelled to live in territory and under conditions as just described.

With the unlimited revenue that the German government could have received from war indemnities, fines levied upon and collected from cities and towns and countries she might invade; public property and revenues of nations and principalities subjugated by her, she would soon have prepared an army and navy that would be invincible and irresistible. England would no longer be mistress of the seas; her navy would soon have been destroyed or subdued and her provinces and colonies, Canada, Australia, India, would one by one fall under Teutonic rule with all that such rule implies.

It has been asserted that all conjectures as to the conditions and events that would have followed and resulted from the intervention of Germany in the Spanish-American war, and continued neutrality of England, are purely chimerical and improbable. In the light of Germany's unrelenting and unscrupulous ambitious plans and intrigues for dominating the world, the perfection of her military preparedness as disclosed by the present European war, one is utterly un-

able to imagine a solitary reason why such surmises are not correct as to what would have happened to this country and the civilized world if Germany had intervened in behalf of Spain, and no person is able to think of any reason why Germany did not do so, except the attitude of England and her superior navy. Ordinarily, it is unprofitable mental exertion to discuss or dwell on the "might have beens," because the past is unchangeable and its events are immutable; but when a kindness or friendly act is known to have averted disaster or ruin, such an episode should be kept ever green and fresh in memory, not only as inspiring that noblest of all emotions, gratitude, but to preserve the knowledge gained by experience.

In days to come, if civilization survives this war and the length and breadth, height and depth of Teutonic cruelty and barbarity have been sounded and measured, Americans will be better able to realize what England did for their country in her hour of national peril.

## CHAPTER VII.

### SOME LAW-MAKERS AND SOME LAWYERS AFFECTED

THERE is another group of Anglophobists whose superficial attainments would hardly entitle them to notice in a grave and earnest treatise, and who might with propriety be omitted from this analysis—but for the fact that their extreme loquacity and spectacular mental exploits sometimes affect the opinions of people of real good sense who have not taken the pains to inform themselves on some particular subject—this class of anti-English people from nature or habit are obsessed with the idea that in order to attract attention to themselves and impress others with their sagacity and deep penetration, it is necessary to differ from public opinion or from the majority of the people upon all subjects of public interest. They delight to pose as profound thinkers, and as having gone deeper into the particular subject than the common run of people. It is immaterial which side of a question they take, just so their position appears to be unique. Hav-

ing no other reason for their opinion they are totally without argument to support their contentions. When their positions are challenged, when they think it necessary to support their side of a question they will, like Mark Twain's "Old Sea Captain," serenely and deliberately manufacture history, statistics and incidents out of hand, and will blandly contradict or ignore the undisputed facts of ancient, modern or current history. One of the commonest reasons given by this class of English haters for their dislike is, that England never fights her own wars, but manages to have other nations to do her fighting, or language to the same effect, which involves a denial that Great Britain ever engaged in a war alone or aided by actual fighting in any war between other nations; in other words, they never admit that there was a Waterloo or England's part in it, though undisputed history places the loss of the British in twelve hours' sustained fighting at 13,000 men, and the loss of Bonaparte's army at the hands of the British troops alone at more than 40,000 in killed and wounded. They never seem to have heard of the Peninsula campaign which commenced in 1808, where for more than five years England alone, except with the feeble assistance of a few disheartened Portuguese and

Spanish soldiers, grappled with the legions of Bonaparte, finally driving Joseph Bonaparte from the Spanish throne, leaving on the battlefields countless thousands of dead Englishmen, dying for the liberties of the world in resisting autocracy, as they are doing today. A remarkable feature of this kind of Anglophobist is that many of them are educated people; some are school teachers, doctors, lawyers, with occasionally a preacher. Three or four weeks after the battle of the Somme began, and while progressing in all its fury, a school teacher of this type observed to a citizen of my acquaintance that England welcomed the advent of the United States into the war, for the reason that the United States would now do England's share of the fighting. When that remark was made, and for more than three weeks preceding, a constant stream of English blood had been poured out on the soil of France, and heaps of English dead marked the route of their advance; even some of the little tots in the kindergarten were talking of the great battle that England was fighting. The teacher, however, seemed to have been utterly oblivious to that awful conflict and to any other incident of any other war that exhibited the personal courage of the British soldiers. This



particular teacher is an accomplished reader or elocutionist, and can recite Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade" in a manner that is thrilling, but has evidently never learned that the famous "six hundred" were English cavalry.

After careful study of the historical accounts of the scores of wars in which England has been engaged since the days of William the Conqueror—over 800 years—there can be found but one instance that in any manner justifies the charge that England always got other nations to do her fighting. That instance should, from an American point of view, be creditable to the English people. In 1776, George III was hard pressed for troops for his American war. Englishmen refused to volunteer to fight their kinsmen in the colonies. The King did not dare to resort to conscription, as such a method of recruiting his army to fight against Americans of English blood, would have enflamed the people to such a degree as would have endangered the government itself. So King George hired from the Duke of Brunswick 4,300 Brunswick soldiers and 12,000 Hessians. In using this incident to prove their assertion that Great Britain never fights her own battles if she can hire others to do it, these English-haters display their usual perspicacity in fail-



ing to note that the circumstances compelling King George to hire these Hessians discloses the kindly feeling of the English people toward the colonies, which ought to appeal to every fair-minded American, and no just and true American ought to cite the Hessian incident in disparagement of the English people of that day.

Occasionally men of the same order of intellect of this group of English-haters, by some strange political accident or freakish popular impulse find themselves elected to Congress; they soon find an intellectual environment that is new to them, and issues and subjects of legislation that they have never heard of before. Realizing that their lack of knowledge of national affairs and limited natural ability will fail to keep themselves prominently before the country and they will soon lapse into obscurity and remain inconspicuous, they begin to way-lay the course of legislation, until some measure especially desirable to the majority of the members and of urgent necessity to the country is brought forward, when they immediately spring forward as from an ambush, in opposition to it, get their names in the newspapers and their remarks printed and strut about in the lime-light of their cheap notor-

iety, which they confound with popular applause and approval.

When no other opportunity to be conspicuous presents itself, these Anglophobian law-givers will assail the war methods of England and denounce her blockade of German ports, seizing vessels, detaining and searching them for contraband, seizing and examining mail on its way to Germany, etc. They never, however, allude to the fact that England pays the owner for the goods she seizes and that the vessels are released unless it is proven in the English prize court that the cargo is entirely contraband intended for Germany. These statesmen are especially careful never to ruffle the feelings of Germany by alluding to the destruction of the *Lusitania* and hundreds of other ships, involving the loss of thousands of lives, as well as cargoes. As stated by Senator Williams of Mississippi: "They never learn the difference between a prize court and a torpedo."

A few lawyers can be found among this class of Anglophobists, although it appears to be an incongruity for an American lawyer to have a dislike for England and the English government. By the term American lawyer is meant, not the half-read shyster who helps to pervert and con-

fuse the law of the land, but the lawyer who is well grounded in the principles that rule human conduct, declaring what is right and prohibiting what is wrong; rules that are prescribed by a superior power, and designed for the protection of life, liberty and property, and to promote justice between man and man. I refer to the man who by close and honest study of those rules of right and justice—like the Christian who studies the Bible—unconsciously assimilates those principles into his very nature so that they become the guiding force of his own life and conduct, making it impossible for him to be unjust, dishonest, or oppressive towards his fellow men.

These beneficent rules for the guidance of life and conduct of the citizen and for the administration of justice in the tribunals, the American lawyer learns from the common law of England—a system of jurisprudence governing every state in the Union except where it conflicts with some law; it is one of the most vital forces of the Anglo-Saxon people, it is as necessary to their virility as breath is to life. They will live under no other system of laws. The first Congress of the Republic of Texas, held after her independence was established in 1840—adopted the com-

mon law of England as the rule of decision to remain in force in Texas until altered by the legislature; other states have always been under the system. It is as ancient as the civilization of our race; dating back to the time "Whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary"; our forefathers obeyed it, helped to enforce it, relied on it for protection of life and liberty and in pursuit of happiness, just as we do today in every state in the Union. Its principles and rules have been evolved through earnest and conscientious desire for justice and right between the citizens, for the protection of the innocent and punishment of the guilty. In the expressions of eminent English jurists declaring and administering the common law, used centuries ago, can be discerned an earnest and conscientious purpose and desire to ascertain and enforce what was just and right in the particular case under consideration.

Imagine the American lawyer in his own proper court, in a case where it is his right and to his advantage to invoke a rule of the common law of England; listen to his eulogies on the system of jurisprudence; he declares it to be the perfection of human reasoning and natural justice

founded upon the eternal principles of right. He reads extracts from Blackstone and other commentators and from opinions of eminent and renowned English jurists upholding, enforcing, sustaining and construing the common law of England; and if his particular case demands, he will refer to the human spirit of the common law and the tender regard it entertains for the rights of the poor, the weak, the helpless and unfortunate. He extols the nature and attributes of the race of mankind who could involve such a system of laws evidencing their love of civil and religious liberty, their sense of justice and veneration of Deity. He declares—and truthfully—that no inferior, enervated, cowardly or subservient race of people could evolve such a system of laws, or breed the class of men that have upheld it against the assaults of tyrants and autocracy. And afterwards, when you hear that same lawyer of Anglo-Saxon name and blood, slurring at the English people and government, referring to them as arrogant, overbearing, tyrannical, unjust by nature and practice, looking to their own sordid advantages, having no regard for the rights of others, too cowardly to fight their own battles, etc.—it sounds inconsistent and incongruous, and for a

lawyer, who ought to know better, is in exceeding bad taste; like one who slurs at the parents who have brought him into the world and nurtured him in helpless infancy, or like "a bird that befouls its own nest."

## CHAPTER VIII.

### AMERICAN MILITARY CASTE—CONTRABAND— EMBARGO

ONE of the most striking and, at first blush, the most unaccountable anomalies discoverable in the classes of people discussed in this treatise, is the pro-German of English blood in America; it will be observed that various individuals of this class have separate and distinct reasons for this pro-German leaning; with all however their partiality and admiration for Germany naturally creates in them an antipathy for England.

Close attention to the conversation and remarks of these pro-Germans will disclose that a large majority of them constitute a military caste distinct from the military and naval circles of the United States. They regard military virtue as the most exalted and the most important of all intellectual and moral qualities; and military preparation and success as the very acme of human achievement. It is difficult to assign a satisfactory reason why any man in civil life in America, raised amidst peaceable and kindly environments,

could conceive such a love for the art of killing people or love for a nationality that makes it its business to kill people. One explanation is heredity: that their instincts and tastes hark back to ancestors of the half savage age, when war and bloodshed and conquest was the principal industry of mankind. Another is that the individual or some ancestor or relative has attained some little military renown, which has inoculated the blood of the family with the disease of militarism.

Those having a literary taste have read histories of wars, studied battle-fields and the strategy practised by opposing generals; they have read "Napoleon and his Marshals," "Washington and his Generals," and other books and descriptions of war, warriors and victorious generals, until their whole nature is steeped in militarism; they are ready to voice their approval of a victorious army regardless of the merits of the national quarrel, and are ready to criticize, blame and condemn the vanquished. They are contemptuous and disparaging of a nation that is defeated because of her unpreparedness, and have a worshipful admiration for the nation that is prepared to strike a deadly blow at a moment's notice. They regard military preparedness as a national virtue far exceeding the qualities of mercy, charity,



benevolence, or honor. They regard it far more praiseworthy to annihilate a battalion through a strategic move than to found and maintain a hospital for the poor and afflicted.

From reading and study of battles, of killed and wounded, their minds and sensibilities have become debauched by familiarity—in thought and imagination—with carnage, bloodshed and suffering, until they have become cruel and heartless; they have become thoroughly Prussianized and speak bitterly and offensively of England, because of her unpreparedness for the present war, saying that she deserves defeat and all of the loss and suffering of her people for not being prepared. They sided with Germany in all disputes with the United States regarding the destruction of the *Lusitania* and other vessels by German submarines. They declare that if Germany has the ability through relentless submarine warfare to reduce England to submission, it is her perfect right to do so, even though neutral passenger ships and inoffensive non-combatants are destroyed. They do not believe that the Almighty has any special control or supervision over the affairs or fates of nations, or any power over the result of battles; they subscribe to the favorite aphorism of Napoleon Bonaparte, that

"Heaven has always been found favorable to strong battalions."

They believe that might is right, and that this world ought to be ruled by the nation that is mightiest in warfare, and is possessed of means and instrumentalities for the greatest destruction of human life. They applaud the German genius and "Kultur" that perfected the submarine and torpedo, and the invention and use of liquid fire and poisonous gases; in short, they assert that no consideration for humanity, preservation of life, or for international agreement or law should in any degree limit warring nations in the use of any means or methods of destroying human life and habitation that they may think necessary to achieve victory over the enemy.

This class of men should be regarded as more dangerous to this country than any other kind of English hater, for many of them are educated and influential citizens, some few are politicians. It is true that the Federal law relating to treason and treasonable utterances has, since the declaration of war against Germany, shorn this class of men of power to do much harm to our country; but there still remains to them the power and privilege of slurring the English people, and thereby to poison the minds of American

boys who will soon be sent to France. In many instances this Prussianism with all the evils and disaster to the human race which that term implies, and which has been absorbed by the class of Americans just described, will descend to and be assimilated by their children and be perpetuated in future generations. If the allies are victorious in this war, and put an eternal end to autocracy and militarism, such Prussian ideas and ideals can have but little effect, and will be but a slight menace to civilization; no more in fact than an active partisanship in the rivalry between Julius Caesar and Pompey in this age. But this class of pro-Germans will never again become good Americans. They have drifted too far from American ideals and principles, and should the allies go down in this struggle, such a strong element of Prussianized Americans in this country will be a canker in the heart of democracy.

The next class of Anglophobists in the order selected for analysis, ground their dislike upon incidents happening since the beginning of the present European war. With the exception of a few politicians—who have tried to use this class or lead it purely for political advantage—they are anti-English solely upon pecuniary grounds, and

because some commodity produced, or owned by them or in which they speculate, has been diminished in value by the maritime policy of Great Britain in force since the war began; the most of them have but little knowledge and precious little respect for the laws of nations, or what is commonly termed international law; they regard it as a vague, misty half-formed understanding—or misunderstanding—of some of the civilized nations of the world to do, or not to do, certain things; laws without any penalty or power of enforcement; binding upon the conscience, only in cases where there is a conscience, and in no case to be considered when they are in conflict with the interest or inclination of a nation or individual.

It may be remarked in passing that this is the Teutonic conception of international law. But with all other civilized nations, especially with Great Britain and the United States, it is a recognized system of jurisprudence, embracing every condition or question likely to arise between nations, whether arising during peace or during war. These laws are not codified and promulgated by a legislative power as state or national laws are created with penalties attached; there is no tribunal clothed with power or au-

thority to enforce conformity to these laws by punishment of the violators. Obedience and conformity to them rests upon the honor of each nation, and their construction is based upon principles of strict justice, and due consideration of the rights of other nations, strong or weak. While not codified, the international laws are contained in a large number of text books and treatises; in the customs and usage of nations in particular cases; in decision and rulings of the prize courts of different nationalities. Every law student is required to study and be examined upon this branch of the law before being admitted to the bar.

The system, like every other system of laws evolved from human intelligence, is constantly developing towards perfection. National conduct in respect to certain matters, recognized and approved by international law one hundred years ago as permissible, is now disapproved by that system; especially have such innovations occurred in those rules regulating the commerce between neutral and belligerent nations in the time of war—where there is no strict or close blockade by one belligerent nation of the ports of the other—it is perfectly natural that two nations may honestly differ in respect to what is the law in a particular case where a change in the law has de-

veloped; one nation may insist on the rule as it existed, and the other may insist on the law as changed by common consent, custom and usage of nations. Such a difference of construction does not necessarily argue want of national integrity or fairness on the part of either. A very apt and appropriate illustration of such a disagreement is found in the arrest, search and detention by Great Britain, with in most instances a trial in an English prize court, of neutral vessels from neutral ports, bound for Holland, Denmark or Sweden, resulting sometimes in the condemnation of these vessels and cargoes, in whole or in part,—the United States insisting that such conduct was a violation of the rights of neutrals under the provisions of international law.

The United States, while conceding the right of Great Britain as a belligerent to declare what articles or commodities should be prohibited as contraband, from a neutral country to Germany, and the right of search for and seizure of such contraband on neutral vessels on the high seas, contends that such right of search and seizure exists only when the vessel is bound for some German seaport, and not when it is for a neutral port. Replying, Great Britain declares that if the contraband is intended for Germany it is subject to

seizure on the high seas although actually bound for a neutral port, and cites a case occurring during our civil war, wherein the United States overhauled a ship-load of war munitions on the high seas which was en route from England to Jamaica—a neutral country and her dependency—claiming that the munitions were really intended for the Confederate States and designed to be shipped on blockade runners from Jamaica to the Southern Confederacy.

The ship and its cargo were taken to the United States, condemned in her prize court and confiscated. Great Britain further claims that the contraband goods seized by her and confiscated were condemned in her prize courts upon full and conclusive proof that such goods were en route to Germany; goods when owned by neutrals were invariably paid for by her. So there you have a stand off, both nations claiming to be acting within the law, but honestly differing as to what it is. Quite a number of Americans who were cotton raisers or merchants who were carrying cotton raisers, and cotton speculators led by a few clamorous politicians, instigated a furious propaganda against Great Britain, and incidentally against the United States Government, on account of the policy pursued by Great Britain



in seizing contraband found upon neutral vessels on the high seas; and against the United States Government for not placing an embargo on the shipment of munitions from this country to the allies. The propaganda was put forth with the utmost bitterness; one prominent politician had himself interviewed, and assailed the foreign and domestic policies of the administration, proclaiming what he would do if he were president, and among many other innovations of such policies he declared that he would place an embargo on all shipments of munitions of war from this country to the allies, until Great Britain omitted cotton from her contraband restrictions. Many people endorsed such ideas; although not having suffered any loss by the seizure of cotton, they conceived that Great Britain's maritime policy would affect the price of their cotton, and demanded that she should abandon what she regarded as her rights under international law, so as to prevent a decline in price; and in one state a mass meeting of all people interested in the cotton business was called for the purpose of coercing our government to proclaim the munitions embargo. It should be observed here to the honor and credit of the patriotic Americans of that state that this mass meeting was a dreary



failure, and the embryonic pro-German organization collapsed. Not one not on inmate of an asylum for imbeciles can be found who will stultify himself by saying that this embargo scheme was not in the interest of the Central Powers. For more than forty years Germany had been preparing for this war, had accumulated an inexhaustible supply of all kinds of war material; she needed nothing of the kind from other nations, except cotton for making explosives. In 1915, if the Allies had been deprived of supplies of war munitions from America by an embargo, there is no doubt they would have gone down in defeat.

## CHAPTER IX.

### EMBARGO, PROPAGANDISTS AND AMERICAN ESAUS

THERE can be no doubt that German intrigue was at the bottom of the propaganda to place an embargo on the shipment of munitions of war to the Allies. The notes from Germany and Austria to the United States government concerning the depredations of the submarines on our shipping attempted to justify such depredations by alluding to the munitions of war that were being supplied to the Allies by American manufacturers, claiming that these supplies were prolonging the war, which meant that the Central Powers, being well stocked with war material, could soon overcome the Allies and establish German ascendancy in the world if the United States would prohibit exportation of war munitions to the Allies. The pressure brought to bear on the United States by the propaganda was really to accomplish this defeat of the Allies, and its real purpose and object was not even concealed by Germany. It is not surprising, however, that a certain class of American politicians should lead in this propa-

ganda; they are men who place their own political success above every other consideration; their love of country is measured by the personal benefit that they derive from their country; they were either employed by the German intriguers, or, what is equally disgusting and contemptible, were making a bid for the German-American vote in their respective states or districts.

But the saddest, the most incredible, the most incomprehensible feature of the attempt to force the United States into an unneutral attitude, and come to the aid of Germany by placing an embargo on munitions shipments, is, that Americans of Anglo-Saxon descent chiefly residing in the Southern states should have allowed themselves to be made tools of by the German intriguers and time-serving politicians, or should have allowed themselves to be worked up into such a state of intense exasperation against England by her supposed cotton contraband and against their own government and its policies. These Americans were not illiterate or ignorant; they well knew that the success of the propaganda would result in practically disarming the Allies and in giving easy and speedy victory to Germany; they well knew that such a victory would soon lead to a conquest of this country and ultimate domination

of the world by Germany. They were not ignorant of what German conquest would mean to this or any other country that offered resistance to her incursions; the very stones in the streets of the shattered cities and villages of Belgium, France, and Servia, are mute but eloquent heralds of the calamities that would result from such resistance.

These Americans well knew that Prussianism and militarism with all the tyranny and barbarism that such a term implies would take the place of the civil and religious liberties of our democratic government, and that dirty and murderous Huns would be placed as masters over our fair women and brave men. Yet in the face of all these possibilities and eminent probabilities, these Americans, who record an English name in their family Bible when a child is born to them; these Americans whose fathers in 1865, at Appomatox Court House "buttoned their paroles in their faded grey jackets, casting one lingering look at the green hills of old Virginia where reposing in eternal sleep lay their fallen comrades, turned their faces to their devastated and war ruined South"; these American propagandists for a munitions embargo, sons of those Confederate soldiers, who by patient labor and courage restored to prosperity and happiness their war-wrecked, desolate

Southland, were perfectly willing to have that same land laid desolate again, not in the cause of liberty and freedom, as their fathers believed, but in order that the price of cotton should remain at ten cents the pound, and that England might be prostrated by the Huns.

For more than four thousand years Esau has been held up to the scorn and contempt of mankind as the supreme example of improvidence for selling his birthright to his brother, Jacob, for a mess of pottage, but he received a princely recompense for his birthright compared to that which these Anglo-Americans were ready to accept for their birthright.

Esau's birthright was a vague, intangible something that would give him the right to be called the head of a tribe that was yet to be born into the world, and when he considered that his brother Jacob and descendants would be a part of that tribe, and knowing his brother Jacob as he did, he seemed to have regarded being the head of his family as of very doubtful honor, and of but little profit or pleasure, for he said: "What profit shall this birthright be to me?" Esau had returned from an unsuccessful hunt, his arrows all sped; disappointed, tired, hungry and exhausted, "he came from the field and was faint."

The birthright of these American embargo propagandists that they proposed to barter was something that was definite, certain, and valuable; it was the right of self government; freedom from tyranny; equality before the law; civil and religious liberty; their right to be counted as part of one of the greatest nations that ever existed; their right of heritage to the honor which belonged to the statesmen and patriots who founded our government and established our democratic institutions; and their heritage to the honor that belonged to those whose greatness and wisdom have preserved, upheld and expanded our country and people. They did not even have the excuse of hunger, privation, or hard times, as did poor Esau, to justify their attempted barter of their divine blessings, for their country was never before so prosperous nor its people better fed or clothed. However, they were willing to surrender or barter all this birthright in order to receive a few cents more per pound for one year's crop of cotton and to punish Great Britain for trying to deprive Germany of cotton that she needed in making explosives.

It would seem that even the slightest consideration for other interests would have moderated the zeal of the munition embargo propagandists;

they were not ignorant of the countless millions of dollars pouring into this country to pay for these munitions of war, nor the fact that millions of dollars were invested by Americans in plants for their manufacture, nor that countless thousands of men and women in the United States were given employment and a chance to earn their bread in the manufacture of war material of all kinds; they could not have been ignorant that an embargo would have ended the prosperity of this country produced by the immense volume of money sent by allied nations into the country in payment for the war munitions, nor to the fact that the embargo would have brought bankruptcy, loss of employment, distress and starvation to countless thousands of manufacturers and employees. It will not do to attempt the pose of humanitarians by claiming that the embargo would have checked the effusion of blood and destruction of human life, because it would have only checked the flow of German and Turkish blood, not the blood of England, France, Russia, Italy, Belgium, and Servia; Germany with her immense stock of war material would have seen to that.

It is enough to cause the patriot, philanthropist and humanitarian to stand appalled at the reck-



less disregard exhibited by intelligent American citizens for the cause of humanity, love of country, for the welfare and happiness of their own countrymen and themselves, by seeking to enforce the embargo against war material, merely to satisfy a dislike for England, and greed for a little more money for their cotton. If the policies of our government could be controlled by men of such a nature and disposition, ready to sacrifice to greed and malice those things that Americans hold most dear, it might well be doubted that our people are really capable of self-government. Their captious and inconsiderate tendency is exhibited in their failing to ascertain, as they might have done, that up to the time of their most strenuous contention and for sometime afterwards, cotton had not, in fact, been declared contraband by Great Britain, but had been omitted originally from the list out of consideration for the American people.

## CHAPTER X.

### CIVILIZATION AND PLANS OF STEPHANUS

JOHANNES PAUL KRUGER

THERE has not been since the war of 1812 in this country such an outburst of indignation and abuse of England as occurred at the outbreak of the Boer war; mass meetings were held at different places in the United States at which speeches were made picturing the Boer nation as a small white republic of harmless, intelligent, God-fearing people, inspired with sturdy independence and love of liberty, who a generation or two ago had been driven from Cape Colony by the oppression of Great Britain, and had "treked" northwards hundreds of miles and finally located in far away Transvaal; and amidst privation and dangers and with hard labor had established comfortable homes, opened farms, stocked ranches, built up towns and cities, formed a government and enacted laws that suited their nation and necessities. That the discovery of gold and diamond mines in their country of untold riches had brought fabulous wealth to the little nation, which was at peace with all the world. That such discoveries had excited the

cupidity and avarice of Great Britain, who was waging the war to rob them of their wealth, as well as to subject them to tribute for all time to come. Such appeals and denunciations were left unanswered, and, as usual, when people are excited they scarcely ever stop to consider both sides of a question. The result was, as heretofore stated, that many thousand Americans made their way to the Transvaal "under the guise of medical expeditions and outfits" for service in the Boer army; one complete corps went in this way from Chicago. The utterances, denunciations and appeals of the Boer sympathizers in public speeches and in newspaper and magazine articles, of the character as hereinbefore described, had much to do with creating and intensifying the dislike of some Americans for England; many believing today that Great Britain deliberately robbed and plundered the Boers of everything they possessed through avarice and covetousness. It is in line with the object and purpose of this treatise to correct whatever of error exists in the pro-Boer version of the causes and reasons leading up to that war, addressing that sense of fair play and justice, which is the pride and boast of Americans.

The Dutch progenitors of the Boers of Trans-

vaal first settled in Cape Colony about the year 1651. The territory of South Africa, as well as that of North America, at that age of the world was appropriated, colonized, fought over and ceded by the European nations without any reference to the rights of the aborigines to any part of the territory. In America the most tractable of the Indian tribes were sometimes put on reservations, the other tribes were sometimes removed by booze, sometimes by bullets—often by both. In South Africa they controlled the black natives by bullets, booze and bondage. The process by which such territory was acquired was by “Annexation,” a species of contract to which there was only one contracting party and no valuable consideration, not even love and affection. The limits and boundaries of these annexations, usually, like a lawyer’s objection to an indictment—were “vague, uncertain, and indefinite.” They were supposed to extend from the point of discovery or actual possession in every direction until they reached the ocean or the boundaries of some previously annexed territory, claimed by some other European appropriator; for instance, the French nation, by right of discovery, annexed the territory extending from the mouth of the St. Lawrence River to the Rocky Mountains

## Civilization and Plans of Kruger 111

in one direction, and northward to the English possession, and southward to the mouth of the Mississippi River. The English pre-empted the territory extending from Plymouth Rock northward and westward to French territory and southward to the Spanish possessions; so when the Republic of Holland about 1650 annexed Cape Colony, she claimed all the territory to an indefinite distance northward not in conflict with the territory claimed by Portugal, but including the Transvaal country. In 1806 Great Britain acquired all this territory with its undefined boundaries, and continued to rule over it apparently to the satisfaction of the majority of the Dutch inhabitants, until about 1835, when a large proportion of the Dutch or Boer population became exasperated at Great Britain's abolition of slavery, although receiving from Great Britain the full value of the slaves, and also on account of the abolition of some Dutch court and substituting an English court in its place. The Boer population then began their "treking," some going across the Orange River, but within British territory, where they founded what was afterwards known as the Orange Free State Republic. Others "treked" north-eastward to Natal, a part of Cape Colony; but when in 1842 the British es-

tablished their authority over that section, the Boers moved out northeastwardly across the Drackensburg Mountains into Transvaal, where they once more founded their commonwealth. They were followed later on by a large number of Boers from Cape Colony. On account of the bankruptcy of the Transvaal Republic, Great Britain was in 1877 compelled to annex it and administer its affairs for the benefit of its creditors. In December, 1881, the Boers rebelled, and the British being caught without proper support from their government, were defeated in January, 1882, and cut to pieces; this so affected Prime Minister Gladstone that he made peace and acknowledged the independence of the Boer Republic; however retaining the power of Great Britain to veto all foreign treaties that might be entered into by the Boer Republic.

The English people were very much dissatisfied with the manner in which the Prime Minister had managed the affairs of South Africa, claiming that the speedy defeat of the English, and passive surrender of English territory to rebellious subjects, would advertise the English people to the world as a decadent nation, and that the empire was declining and would soon fall to pieces; an impression well calculated to

## Civilization and Plans of Kruger 113

destroy the respect which all the other nations of the world had shown to her; a prediction that was fully verified by expressions in regard to the nation, used by her enemies during the Boer war and during the first two years of the present European war. It was thought and hoped that now, the Boers having achieved permanent independence, and being imbued with intense religious fervor, they would occupy among the nations of the earth a high plane of national integrity and righteousness. But it seems that the insidious poison of greed and ambition soon entered the souls of their President, Stephanus Johannes Paul Kruger, and many of their leaders and people. This president was a man of some ability, possessing force, statecraft and shrewdness—born in Cape Colony, he had as a boy joined in the great trek to Transvaal and was steeped and soaked and saturated with hatred for Great Britain and her people. He had some of the Teutonic ideas of the deified nature and character of the State, and believed, like the Kaiser, that it was perfectly right and proper to rob, kill or steal for the benefit of the State.

Soon after becoming president he conceived the idea of expelling the English authority from all of Cape Colony and annexing it to the South



African Republic, and with that purpose in view began intriguing with the Boer population whose ancestors remained in Cape Colony at the time of the great trek, comprising more than one half of the white population. He also began negotiations with the Orange Free State Republic to form an alliance with the Boer Republic to expel the English government, not only from Cape Colony, but also from the vast territory of Great Britain lying west and north of the two Republics, in which were situated the diamond fields of South Africa—all of which territory he designed to consolidate with the two republics and create a Grand Boer Republic that would be larger in extent than the Republic of Mexico. The scheme was comprehensive and daring, and was the first fruit of Gladstone's pacific and submissive policy in yielding to the Boer demands in 1881-82; and, considering the easy defeat of the British in that war, the scheme was from the limited point of view of President Kruger exceedingly plausible and easy of accomplishment. Being very illiterate, he had never read the history of the Anglo-Saxon race or learned, as he did later on, of their courage and determination when once aroused. During the fifteen or more years of his administration as president of the

## Civilization and Plans of Kruger 115

republic his influence over the Volksraad, the legislative branch of his government, caused the enactment of many laws that were oppressive and extortionate against the English people and other foreign property holders in Transvaal, which laws will be discussed in the next chapter.

## CHAPTER XI.

### ORIGINAL "SCRAP OF PAPER" TREATY—DOGS OF WAR LET LOOSE

PREVIOUS to the time of the gold discovery, the Boers of the Transvaal were engaged almost exclusively in agriculture and stockraising. They were industrious and frugal, and the finest rifle shots in the world, made so by hunting wild game and fighting the savage black tribes that infested and surrounded their country. They were intensely religious; it was a custom among them in an emergency to open at random the Bible that each carried with him, and consult the first passage his eye lighted upon, for some hint or expression to guide him in the emergency; a great many of their arguments on scientific and geographic subjects were supported or refuted by reference to the Holy Scriptures.

In the year 1896 a hot controversy was carried on in the Transvaal in regard to the shape of the earth, one faction asserting that it was round, the other denying the rotundity of our planet, maintaining that it was flat; many debates and

written arguments pro and con were uttered and printed. The President, Stephanus Johannes Paul Kruger, espoused the flat theory and printed a thesis on the subject, proving by the scriptural reference to the “Ends of the earth” that the world was flat; pointing out with logic perfectly satisfactory to his side that a globe or any round object had nothing that could be called an end.

The Boer population of the Transvaal, on account of their avocations and isolation were not familiar with scientific pursuits, especially that of mining or mine engineering, and the gold mines of the country soon became owned by the foreigners, designated “out-landers.” Every encouragement was given to foreigners to invest in and develop these mines; the Boer government being compensated by a tax on the gross receipts of the mine owners. The revenue thus derived was vastly more than sufficient to defray government expenses. A large proportion of the excess was used by the president in the purchase abroad of war munitions of every kind and of the latest discovery and improvement. These were stored in various places in the republic; bands of minute men were organized and trained for quick mobilization and field service. Although these

military preparations were going on for years, and although it was publicly known that they were made in contemplation of a war with Great Britain, the British government seemed to have paid no attention to them, at least not until Gladstone's service as Prime Minister ended in 1894. The additional expenses of paying and clothing and provisioning this army required more revenue; this was provided for by several measures of the government that were very oppressive and unjust to the outlander mine owners. One of these measures was the government monopoly of dynamite; the price fixed on this commodity was so extortionate that many of the smaller mine owners were compelled to suspend work in them. This inaction gave the government the right to take charge of these properties and operate them for the benefit of the state. Another oppressive measure against the outlanders and mine owners was a high import duty on all breadstuffs imported into the Transvaal. The high prices for breadstuffs caused by the tariff was especially beneficial to the Boer farmers, and as the farmers of that country produce only about one-sixth of that commodity needed for the consumption in the country, the tariff on the remaining five-sixths that had to be imported, not only produced a

satisfactory revenue, but caused other outlanders to abandon their mines, because they could not afford to pay the increased wages to the miners that became necessary to meet the increased cost of living.

These abandoned mines were all taken over by the Transvaal government. No outlander was permitted to vote or have any voice in the government unless he became a naturalized citizen and renounced forever all allegiance to his native country; and if the authorities believed that such renunciation was merely a temporary expedient to enable him to have a voice in the government, his application for citizenship would be rejected. The city of Johannesburg, a mining town, was founded in 1886, and within ten years it had grown to be a city of more than 102,000 inhabitants. More than three-fourths of the white population of this city were outlanders who owned more than five-sixths of the taxable wealth of the city; but notwithstanding this, they had no vote or voice in the selection of officers or the regulation of municipal affairs, and were constantly subjected to petty annoyances, exactions and official peculation without remedy or redress in the courts or elsewhere.

A petition was sent to Queen Victoria in the

summer of 1899 detailing the grievances of the outlanders and signed by 21,000 British subjects in the Transvaal; but it failed to bring any relief. To check the growing strength of the outlanders an anti-emigration law was passed by the Volksraad, which was in direct violation of the existing treaty with Great Britain. President Kruger, in the summer of 1897, expressly repudiated that part of the treaty of 1881 which gave Great Britain the suzerainty over the Transvaal Republic, which comprised the right to veto any treaty that the Republic might make with any power; at the same time insisting on Great Britain being bound by that part of the treaty securing to the Transvaal Republic its independence. This was the original example of regarding a treaty, or part of a treaty, as a "scrap of paper" when it stood in the way of a nation's ambition or wishes.

About the last of December, 1895, the outlanders of Johannesburg formed a political organization and published a "Bill of Rights"—rights which they claimed to be entitled to as foreign residents of a civilized country. Meantime, several prominent outlanders sent to the English people at Mafeking, across the border, an appeal for help, which together with the publication of the



Bill of Rights led the English people at Mafeking to think the outlanders at Johannesburg were about to revolt against the oppression of the Transvaal government, whereupon about 700 English volunteers, headed by Jameson, started a raid to Johannesburg, a distance of about 100 miles. The expected uprising of Johannesburg failed to materialize. The preparedness of the Transvaal Republic for war was exhibited when more than 2,000 well armed Boer troops were assembled in less than forty-eight hours from the time the authorities received news of the raid. These met the English before they reached Johannesburg and surrounded and captured them. President Kruger was in favor of shooting the English as filibusters. Secretary Chamberlain telegraphed to Kruger disavowing the raid and asking for kind treatment of the raiders. The president finally yielded to conservative counsel of prominent citizens and officials who dreaded the consequences that might follow upon the anger of the English, aroused by the execution of the raiders; so Jameson was conducted across the frontier and sailed for England where he and others were tried and convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for terms ranging from six to fifteen months for raiding the republic.

The assurance and arrogance of the President in the successful consummation of his ambitious schemes was extravagantly increased by receiving a telegram of congratulations from the German Emperor on the outcome of the Jameson raid.

His intrigues with the Boers of Cape Colony were so successful that many of them openly declared their intention to join the forces of Kruger when he invaded Cape Colony. The Africanders in the Cape of Good Hope Assembly boldly declared their friendship for the Transvaal Boers, and introduced measures tending to commit Cape Colony to the policies of Kruger.

At last the British government aroused from its apathy and realized the nature and extent of the ambition of the rulers of the Transvaal Republic. After the President, Styn, let it be known that the Orange Free State Republic would side with the Transvaal in case of war with England, Great Britain prevailed on the Portugese government to prohibit further shipment of war munitions through Portuguese territory to the Transvaal, and moved 30,000 reserves from England to the northeast frontier of Cape Colony to resist the threatened invasion of British possessions.

On the 10th of October, 1899, the Transvaal

government demanded the withdrawal of all British troops from the frontier, as well as the return to England of all reinforcements to the British army that had been brought to Cape Colony since June of that year, fixing the next day as the time in which Great Britain should signify her intention to comply with the demand. No response being made, Orange Free State declared war against England, and the Boer forces immediately assumed the offensive. So the conflict began that would forever decide the fate of South Africa and the Boer Republics.

## CHAPTER XII.

### COMPARATIVE MANHOOD—KRUGER AND A MIER PRISONER

It would be just as absurd and nonsensical to allege that President Kruger did not plan and prepare years in advance for the war, and did not plan in advance for the campaign that he actually made, and that England forced the war on the Boer Republics, as it would be to assert that Germany had made no preparation for the present war, or that she had made no attack on France, or that she had no previous intention of invading Belgium. The evidence of preparedness, premeditation and campaign planning is as strong, or stronger, in the case of the Boers than it is in the case of the Germans. Two days after war was declared the Boers had mobilized a force on the west border and laid siege to Mafeking, and on the same day they laid siege to Kimberly, 250 miles south of Mafeking, and five days later they attacked and defeated the British forces at Dundee, 400 miles east of Kimberly. On the next day after the declaration of war a

strong force of Boers captured a British armoured train 50 miles south of Mafeking. The presence of the Boer troops in such numbers at places so widely separated, and their offensive action, is quite sufficient to prove that the Transvaal Republic was the aggressor and had been so from the beginning. Never in all history had Great Britain manifested such a desire for peace with an aggressive people; she had never before shown such patience and forbearance and willingness, in order to keep the peace, to yield to arrogant and presumptuous demands; never before had she failed to demand reparation for injuries done to her subjects, in person and in property rights. The sudden and successful attacks on the British forces, in which thousands of British soldiers were laid low by the marksmanship of Boer riflemen, caused a shout of exultation among the enemies of England throughout the world. In the United States it took the form of extravagant praise and fulsome eulogy for President Kruger that was almost idolatrous. He was compared to George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Simon Bolivar and other great leaders of peoples struggling for freedom and liberty. His picture was printed in magazines and newspapers, posted at public places, and placed on a special brand of

cigars. The smallest details of his life, current and past, were dug up and given to the public, including the noted feat of wrenching an offending tooth from his jaw with a pair of bullet moulds. Verses were written about him and inscribed to him; he was affectionately referred to as "Oom Paul," which in the Dutch vernacular is "Uncle Paul," all of which was enough to turn his head if it had not already been addled with success and praise.

After about eighteen months of strife, carnage and destruction of property in the Boer Republics "Oom Paul" saw the handwriting on the wall, and his retirement from public life and gaze can best be described by introducing at this point, as a standard comparison, an episode in the life of one of the grand men of Texas, and for this purpose I beg of the readers the privilege of just one digression.

About the year 1840 a young English lawyer located at Matagorda, Texas. His name was James C. Wilson; soon afterwards he joined the expedition under General Alexander Somerville sent by President Houston to the Rio Grande, and was one of the three hundred men captured at Mier in old Mexico, and so became one of the historic "Mier prisoners"; and was one of those

prisoners who overpowered their Mexican guard and attempted to escape, but were recaptured. To punish the attempt Santa Anna ordered one-tenth of the one hundred and seventy-six to be shot. The mode of selecting the victims was by lot, one hundred and fifty-nine white beans and seventeen black beans were placed in an earthen jar, and the prisoners were each required to draw one bean, those drawing the black beans were the victims to be shot. Before the drawing the British consul at the place promised James C. Wilson indemnity if he would claim British protection; even some of his comrades, fellow prisoners, advised him to do so, and so escape the peril of drawing; but what did that magnificent young Englishman say and what did he do? He said: "I have cast my lot with these Texas boys, we have fought together and suffered together; we have stood by each other in privation, in danger, and in face of death; I will not desert them now; if I should draw a black bean I will save the life of one of my comrades and I will take his place in the death line."

He took his turn and draw a white bean and lived. The noblest and best of our race feel it a privilege to stand with uncovered heads as a tribute to such chivalrous heroism as was then



displayed by James C. Wilson. I will digress further by saying that after his return to Texas he resumed the practice of his profession and later entered politics. His ability as a lawyer and statesman was soon recognized throughout the state. He was put forward by his friends as a candidate for the United States Senate, and he seemed to be without opposition; but before the Legislature met, yielding to that strong sense of duty which had always been the propelling force of his life, he suddenly retired from politics, renounced his candidacy, and entered the ministry as an itinerant Methodist preacher. It was my good fortune when a mere child to see him at my father's house, and it was one of the fondest recollections of my life, that the brave hand that drew forth that white bean in that awful lottery of life and death once rested on my youthful head as in a kindly benediction.

When in the summer of 1900 the Boer armies by the pressure of the British forces under Lord Roberts were broken up into guerilla bands, President Stephannus Johannes Paul Kruger had a most excellent chance to display those great qualities of mind and heart which had been attributed to him by his Anglophobist admirers in America and elsewhere. He realized that it was

only a question of time until all resistance of the Boers would be overcome and that his people would lie helpless at the feet of the conqueror. He knew the devastation and ruin that his war had brought to his country, and the famine and distress then existing among the widows and children of the deluded men that had fallen through his ambition for lust and power. Did he distribute the million or two dollars of public money under his control to these starving women and children or to those soldiers who were still fighting for him? Did he remain in the Transvaal and offer to share the disasters and punishment that an outraged conquering nation might choose to inflict upon his deluded countrymen? Did he offer to share in the misfortune, privation and distress that he alone had brought upon his people, or propose to aid in restoring his wasted and war-harried Transvaal? History has answered these questions; "Oom Paul" transmitted to European banks all of the remaining funds of the republic and had them deposited in his own name; and then in disguise, President Stephannus Johannes Paul Kruger crossed the eastern frontier and struck a turkey trot for Delgoa Bay, thence to Europe, where he spent the remainder of his days, like some ex-presidents of South

American republics, living comfortably on the public money that he had sent in advance, while the Boer farmer soldier, who had an equal right to it, struggled for a living with his starving wife and children in the wasted land, a land depleted of food, of live stock, of farm implements, by the war that he, Paul Kruger, had instigated.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### PARALLEL BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN IN THE TREATMENT OF MORMONS, FILIPINOS AND BOERS

IT is a singular perversity in a man whose mind is clouded with prejudice, that he will bitterly condemn the acts of one whom he dislikes, but will pass over or even approve the same thing in another. Ordinarily, it is an unprofitable consumption of time to combat the prejudice of such a man by showing an inconsistency of this kind; however, for the benefit of the pro-Boer Americans who desire to be fair towards Great Britain, I will draw some comparisons between Great Britain's relation to, and treatment of, the Boers, and the treatment of the Mormons, and also the Filipinos, by the United States; and in making these comparisons, I desire to emphasize that the measures taken by our government in the case of the Mormons, as well as the Filipinos, were in every respect right and proper. There are several interesting points of resemblance between the political history and movements of the Boers and

those of the Mormons. The Boers "treked" from Cape Colony to Natal, thence on to the Transvaal, about five hundred miles in all. The Mormons "treked" from Navoo in Missouri to Council Bluff, Iowa, thence on to the Great Salt Lake, in all about fifteen hundred miles. The Boer government robbed the citizens of Great Britain in Transvaal by taxation, tariff and monopoly. The Mormons robbed citizens of the United States, passing through Utah, by bands of robbers under the command of "Destroying Angels"—so called. The Boers claimed that Holland could not cede to England her possessions in South Africa, and deprive the Dutch colonists and descendants of the right to establish an independent government at any point in such possession. The Mormons claimed that Mexico could not cede to the United States territory including Utah and so deprive them of the right to have an independent government of their own. Both countries, Transvaal and Utah, increased in wealth and population until they each became defiant towards the respective governments. In December, 1880, the Boers attacked the British at Heidelberg, Transvaal, killing 112 British soldiers, with Boer losses of one killed and five wounded. After several small, but sweeping,

victories, won by reason of superior marksmanship, in February following the Boers, four hundred in number, stormed Majuba Hill, defended by six hundred British troops, and defeated them, killing eighty-four men and capturing one hundred and twenty-two prisoners, and so gained their independence from the Gladstone government.

The Mormons in 1857, having increased to 40,000 in population, and having with perfect impunity at Mountain Meadow robbed an immigrant train on its way to California, and massacred one hundred and twenty immigrants, they proceeded to drive the federal judge from the bench in Salt Lake City, and destroy the records of the Federal Court, because of an attempt to enforce the United States jurisdiction over the territory, and otherwise asserted their independence of the United States. General Albert Sidney Johnson, with a force of 2,500 men, was dispatched to Utah, who soon suppressed the rebellion. The Filipinos also claimed the right to an independent government, denying that they could be deprived of that right through the cession by Spain of the Philippine Islands to the United States.

There is one feature common to all these par-

ticular aggregations of peoples. They were each led and dominated by one individual: the Mormons by Brigham Young; the Filipinos by Aguinaldo, and the Boers by President Kruger; each of them possessed great force of character and executive ability, but each of them was singularly uninformed of existing conditions in the world, and of the force and power of the two mighty nations that they defied; an ignorance like that displayed by a North American Indian-chief and his tribe starting on the war path, thinking to overcome the United States.

There is another feature common to all these people; they were each conquered by the nation they defied, and are each in far better condition today than as if they had never been conquered; and they have surrendered no right of real value to them. The subjugation of the Filipinos has preserved peace among them, prevented insurrections and internal strife. They have been protected from predatory nations of Europe and Asia on the hunt for territory to colonize or for trade expansion; they have been trained in the arts of civilization and self-government, and are now in a fair way to become a freer, prosperous and happy people. Utah has achieved statehood with freedom and liberty far in excess of that she had un-



der the hierarchy of Brigham Young and his high priests; and all by merely waiving the right of her male citizens to have more than one wife at a time.

This chapter details many apparently meaningless facts, comparisons and analogies, but they are recited for the purpose of driving home to the mind of the pro-Boer American this proposition: if it was right morally and politically for the United States to subjugate and annex the territory of the Filipinos and Mormons, it was right for Great Britain to subjugate the Transvaal and Orange republics. With this difference in favor of Great Britain: the action of the United States was primarily for conquest, that of England was in defense of her territory and of the rights of tens of thousands of her people who had settled in Cape Colony, in Grinuland and in the British East, Central and South African provinces of Nyassaland and Bechuanaland from subjugation and government by people whose rulers had always exhibited a hatred to the English and who had shown a disposition to oppress and extort from the "stranger that was within her gates." It was to protect her wealthy and cultured English citizens of Cape Town, Kimberly, and Mafeking from being ruled and dominated by a people

whose ruler still contended that the world is flat. While dissatisfied with the weakness of the Gladstone administration in tamely surrendering her territory, Great Britain for more than fifteen years in good faith adhered to the treaty conceding the independence of the Transvaal Republic, and treated that nation with all the respect and consideration due the sovereignty of an independent government; notwithstanding the repeated violation of a part of the treaty by the Boer president, the part which gave Great Britain her suzerainty. And there is no doubt that the Transvaal Republic would be in existence today if its government had been directed by wise, conservative and enlightened statesmanship. It had been clearly demonstrated that the two peoples, English and Boers, could not live at peace in adjoining territory under separate and independent governments. Conditions demanded that both races should be under the same ruler; and so after the war started it soon became a life and death struggle for governmental sovereignty. On the part of the Boers it was a war of conquest as well as for more complete independence by the abrogation of British suzerainty; on the part of Great Britain it was to maintain her sovereignty in her South African possessions and to protect

the lives, liberty and property of her English subjects.

Great Britain was victorious. Most of the Boer leaders and many of the citizens abandoned the country. Those that remained were sunken in abject poverty and many rendered homeless by the devastations of the war. It was then that the English government exhibited that magnanimity that was never in all history of warfare before shown by a conquering nation to its vanquished foe, and is enough to make every man of Anglo-Saxon blood proud of his race. Great Britain supplied those poor Boers with food, with clothing, with work stock, with domestic animals, with farm implements, with building material to rebuild their homes; free schools were provided for their children. They were treated like human beings, they were soon given local self government with far more wholesome liberty than they had ever possessed under the oligarchy of Kruger and his associates. This kind of treatment was not without effect on the Boer population; it seemed to open their eyes to the manner in which they had been deceived and exploited by their rulers; they have shown their loyalty and gratitude to the English government during the present war by driving the Germans out of their col-

onies in East and West Africa, besides furnishing many gallant soldiers for the trenches in France. I invite the Anglophobist who possesses magnanimity, nobility of character and chivalry, and can appreciate these qualities in others, to compare this English treatment with the treatment given to the people of France, Belgium and Siberia by the German government.

THE END

---

## NOTE

The authorities and in part the sources of information used in this treatise are as follows:

Green's History of England, Vol. 3 and 4; History of the Nineteenth Century, by Dr. Edwin Emerson; Messages and Papers of The Presidents (Administrations of Adams, Jefferson and Madison); Bissett's History of The Reign of George III (Edition 1828), Vols. 1 to 5—History of The American People, by Woodrow Wilson; History of France, Vol. 7, by M. Guizot; History of Revolutions in Europe, by C. W. Koch (Edition of 1832); Pennybacker's New History of Texas.





HM. Mod.  
G7716a

217067

Author Cook, J. G.

Title Anglaphobia.

University of Toronto  
Library

DO NOT  
REMOVE  
THE  
CARD  
FROM  
THIS  
POCKET

Acme Library Card Pocket  
Under Pat "Ref. Index File"  
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU

